



## King's Research Portal

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

O'Donnell, A-L. (Accepted/In press). The Politics of the Print Medium: The Professional Code and the 1764 Paxton Boys Debate. *Book History*.

### **Citing this paper**

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## **The Politics of the Print Medium: The Professional Code and the 1764 Paxton Boys Debate**

On 14 December 1763, during a period of renewed hostilities between white and Indian communities, fifty-seven white colonists from western Pennsylvania attacked the Conestoga manor and massacred the six Native American residents there. At the time, a further fourteen residents of Conestoga had been away selling baskets, and after hearing of the murders, they fled to Lancaster town where the local elites offered them refuge in the county gaol. Two weeks later, on 27 December 1763, a group of fifty white Pennsylvanians rode into Lancaster to finish off the remaining Conestoga residents. The colonists broke open the gaol and killed the fourteen Indians sheltering there. The brutality of the two attacks terrified Indian communities throughout Pennsylvania and one hundred and fifty Native Americans sought sanctuary in the provincial capital, Philadelphia. Immediately following the Lancaster massacre, there were rumours that the western colonists planned to gather hundreds of supporters to march on Philadelphia to kill the Native Americans and anyone protecting them. This threat sent the capital into panic. The citizens erected barricades in the streets and volunteers organised themselves into armed companies. Throughout January and into February, Philadelphians repeatedly sounded alarms and prepared to repulse the advancing rioters violently. On 4 February 1764, the rioters arrived just outside Philadelphia in Germantown. The news caused further panic in the city, but eventually, the provincial elite put together a delegation, including local notable Benjamin Franklin, to meet with the rioters and discuss terms. The rioters, known as the Paxton Boys for their supposed origins around Paxton town, dispersed after the delegation agreed that the government would hear the grievances of the western Pennsylvanians. The massacre and the march on Philadelphia precipitated one of the most prolific and disruptive printed debates in colonial American history.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, and of particular interest to book historians, the print medium itself contributed to the disruptiveness of the debate.

---

<sup>1</sup> As Kevin Kenny argued persuasively in the first book-length study of the event, the Paxton Boys signalled the end of William Penn's dream of a Peaceable Kingdom where white and Indian communities would live harmoniously. The rioters themselves were never prosecuted and attacks against Native American communities continued throughout the last decade of the colonial period until, during the war for independence, violence against Native Americans became a patriotic duty. In the short term, the debate also changed the balance of power in Pennsylvanian politics. In one of the highest turnouts at annual elections, voters unseated two longstanding doyens of Pennsylvanian politics, Benjamin Franklin and Joseph Galloway. Meanwhile, the controversies thrown up during

Looking at the Paxton Boys texts through a bibliographical lens reveals something of the character of the debate. Most significantly, the debate was large scale. Between January and November 1764, Pennsylvanian printers produced one hundred and nine editions of texts in English and German that either explicitly discussed the Paxton Boys or else responded to a text that had.<sup>2</sup> Alison Olson estimated that the volume of Paxton material produced in 1764 represented a 40% increase in publications over the previous year. The Paxton Boys texts themselves constituted 20% of all printed items produced in the province and while Olson was not explicit in what she was counting, these estimates are suggestive that the Paxton Boys was a major moment in early American printing. Despite involving a large number of editions, the debate was coherent and focused on responses to the Paxton Boys. Seventy-seven of the hundred and nine editions explicitly mentioned the Paxton Boys, their massacre of Native Americans, or their march on the city. The remaining thirty-two editions referred to one or more of the other texts. While most texts were in English—eighty-nine editions—there was a significant minority of twenty German-language editions. This German intervention in the debate broke down a longstanding language barrier in Pennsylvanian print culture. The debate was lively. In the bibliography appendix to this article, there are eighty-two unique titles and ten German translations of Anglophonic titles. Fifteen entries are second editions or variant imprints and two entries are third or fourth editions. *A Serious Address* was the most reissued title with four editions. The debate was relatively accessible for most readers as many texts were available in cheap formats. Although printers produced texts from broadside to sextodecimo, the cheaper octavo was the most common format.<sup>3</sup> There was also a wide range in the number of pages, from single-sided handbills to a ninety-six-page octavo German translation. However, most texts were smaller and presumably cheaper. The average length was thirteen pages, but most pamphlets were eight pages long, meaning that the majority of texts were only one or two

---

the debate significantly eroded the Quaker dominance of the legislative assembly and led to the rise of a new partisan force of the people out-of-doors. The debate also signalled the ascendancy of previously marginalised groups, including the Presbyterians, the Scotch-Irish, the Germans, and western interests generally. Cooperation between these groups led to a shared white identity that emboldened crowds during the American Revolution. Kevin Kenny, *Peaceable Kingdom Lost: The Paxton Boys and the Destruction of William Penn's Holy Experiment* (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2009).

<sup>2</sup> See appendix one.

<sup>3</sup> As the reader for this article identified, distinguishing between octavo and sextodecimo can be difficult. The American Antiquarian Society lists two sextodecimo editions as octavo. For the article, I have followed the format listed in Charles Evans' *American Bibliography* and the Digital Paxton project, but more importantly, different editions may have used different paper stock resulting in technically different formats. However, the small format was still the most prevalent among the hundred and nine editions.

sheets of paper. These disruptive texts were broadly accessible because authors used cheap prints to continue the controversies of the longer pieces while appealing to both German and English audiences.

However, for a debate renowned for its printedness, there has not been a sustained history-of-book-style analysis of the texts. Most research thus far has concentrated on the content of the texts, overlooking how print as the medium of debate affected the course of the dispute. Historians have demonstrated that the Paxton Boys massacre and the march on Philadelphia were the result of longstanding and deteriorating sectional divisions in the province.<sup>4</sup> They have analysed the Paxton Boys texts to understand the composition and organisation of Pennsylvanian society and reveal insights into how the province transformed in the aftermath of the Paxton Boys.<sup>5</sup> One recurrent issue in the

---

<sup>4</sup> The historiography on the Paxton Boys is extensive. The earliest works on this topic characterised the Paxton Boys as the result of an underrepresented western population challenging eastern authority. Brooke Hindle, 'The March of the Paxton Boys', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3:4 (1946), 461 – 86. This emphasis on sectional divides between the 'urban and commercial east and the rural and agricultural west' underpinned John Dunbar's narrative of events in *The Paxton Papers*, the first collection of Paxton Boys printed material. John Dunbar, ed., *The Paxton Boys* (The Hague; Martinus Nijhoff, 1957), p. 3. Later works have nuanced this sectional division in a number of critical ways. Alden Vaughan argued that colonial officials could not exercise sufficient authority in western Pennsylvania to restrain violence against Native Americans or even prosecute the perpetrators. As such, the legacy of the Paxton Boys was continued violence against the Indians that helps explain why so many Native Americans allied with the British during the American Revolution. Alden Vaughan, 'Frontier Banditti and the Indians: The Paxton Boys' Legacy, 1763 – 1775', *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*, 51:1 (1984), pp. 1 – 29. In the only monograph on the Paxton Boys, Kevin Kenny argues that the Paxton Boys represented colonialist impulse that had been evident since William Penn's initial plan. The inability of the eastern authorities to bring the Paxton Boys to justice meant they continued to pursue a self-interested policy of violent conflict with Native Americans in order to expand their own land holdings. Kenny, *Peaceable Kingdom Lost*, pp. 230 – 1. Along similar lines, Patrick Griffin put the sectional conflict in an imperial framework by arguing that the Paxton Boys riot challenged the vision of empire set out in London and supported by authorities in eastern Pennsylvania. Patrick Griffin, *American Leviathan: Empire, Nation, and Revolutionary Frontier* (New York, NY; Hill and Wang, 2007), pp. 49 – 50. The power of the Paxton Boys to change policy in the east is an important line of argumentation in the literature. John Smolenski argues that the Paxton Boys debate provided an opportunity for the western colonists to assert that Indians had no legal status in Pennsylvanian society and were an alien threat to the community. Therefore, the massacres were not illegal murders, but rather a duty to the King in protecting his realm. John Smolenski, 'Murder on the Margins: The Paxton Massacre and the Remaking of Sovereignty in Colonial Pennsylvania', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 19:6 (2015), 513 – 538. Patrick Spero argues that the Paxton Boys riots created a firm racial frontier between white settlers and Native Americans that allowed the Paxton Boys to negotiate better with the eastern authorities and create a political culture more amenable to their aspirations. Patrick Spero, *Frontier Country: The Politics of War in Early Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, PA; University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), pp. 154 – 8. However, as Scott Paul Gordon argues, this sectional divide was not just between western and eastern Pennsylvania. While the Paxton Boys debate worked through the implications of the march for Philadelphia, there were significant local conditions that show they specifically challenged the authority of Edward Shippen in western Pennsylvania. Scott Paul Gordon, 'The Paxton Boys and Edward Shippen: Defiance and Deference on a Collapsing Frontier', *Early American Studies*, 14:2 (2016), 319 – 347.

<sup>5</sup> The Paxton Boys has been useful for understanding a variety of issues about Pennsylvania, including the creation of a white identity in America. Peter Silver argues violence transformed Pennsylvanian society. The experience of war as well as the invocation of Indian atrocities united colonists against an external Native American enemy as a group of white people. Moreover, it was the ordinary, non-elite, white people, most often victims of this violence, who found themselves elevated to the centre of politics. Central to this development was the emergence of an 'anti-Indian sublime'. The sublime was a political logic developed in the Paxton Boys debate then deployed successfully during the revolution to undermine British authority. Peter Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America* (New York, NY; W. W. Norton & Company, 2008), pp. xix – xxii. On the same issue, Benjamin Bankhurst argues that the Paxton Boys debate demonstrates that even as the issue of race was gaining in

historiography is the political deadlock that followed the Paxton Boys riot. The deadlock prevented an effective government response to the disorder of the Paxton Boys, so authors moved the forum for the debate from the halls of the State House out to public prints in the streets. This transition from politics within-doors to politics out-of-doors is significant because the print medium itself affected the trajectory of the debate. Moving the debate beyond the State House entailed recruiting a network of print professionals to turn manuscripts into printed texts. These print professionals had a transformative effect on how an author's ideas were conveyed to the reading audience. Print professionals shaped the visual presentation of the words on the page as well as the distribution of printed material to readers. In many cases, these interventions highlighted the most divisive elements of the argument adding to the vitriolic and polarising tone of the dispute. And while this level of vitriol was not new to Pennsylvanian politics, the effect of the print medium has not been fully explored as a contributing factor to the course and legacy of the prolific 1764 debate.<sup>6</sup>

To analyse the implications of this printedness for the Paxton Boys debate, I have used both enumerative and analytical bibliography methods. The article is based on my enumerative bibliography work compiling a catalogue of texts printed in 1764 that responded to the Paxton Boys events. Until now,

---

significance, Pennsylvanian authors still perceived their identity according to concepts developed in Europe over the last hundred years. Benjamin Bankhurst, 'A Looking-Glass for Presbyterians: Recasting a Prejudice in Late Colonial Pennsylvania', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 133:4 (2009), 317 – 48. John Smolenski focused on the gendered language in the texts to expose the anxieties associated with civic society at the edge of the British Empire. Effectively, by charging their opponents with unmanly behaviour, the Paxton Boys authors asserted their own place within a white civic culture. John Smolenski, 'Embodied Politics: The Paxton Uprising and the Gendering of Civic Culture in Colonial Pennsylvania', *Early American Studies*, 14:2 (2016), 377 – 407. The Paxton Boys texts are also useful for understanding the negotiation of power and authority. At the most basic level, Alison Olson's work on satire in the Paxton Boys debate demonstrates how the more politically connected anti-Paxton authors effectively lost the debate against the Paxton apologists. This reversal of fortune is an important feature of much of the historiography. Alison Olson, 'The Pamphlet War over the Paxton Boys', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 123:1/2 (1999), 31 – 55. Jeremy Engels argued that the language of the Paxton Boys debate was a form of rhetorical colonialism that justified violence against Native Americans by re-defining them as Indians and calling the violence against them revenge. Jeremy Engels, "'Equipped for Murder": The Paxton Boys and "the Spirit of Killing all Indians" in Pennsylvania, 1763 – 1764', *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 8:3 (2005), 355 – 81. Nicole Eustace analysed the emotional language to argue that the texts reveal a contest over legitimacy of the western violence. Paxton apologists argued their massacre represented the last resort of a marginalised people, while their opponents characterised the massacre and the march on Philadelphia as indicative of the western colonists inability to govern effectively. Nicole Eustace, *Passion is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, NC; University of North Carolina Press, 2008), pp. 335 – 67. Finally, Judith Ridner focused on the representations of material culture within the Paxton Boys debate in order to argue it was a moment for rivals throughout Pennsylvania to advance their own interests in the province. Judith Ridner, 'Unmasking the Paxton Boys: The Material Culture of the Pamphlet War', *Early American Studies*, 14:2 (2016), 348 – 76.

<sup>6</sup> Thomas P. Slaughter, 'Crowds in Eighteenth-Century America: Reflections and New Directions', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 115.1 (1991), 3 – 34.

there has not been a catalogue of this nature. John Dunbar's 1953 *Paxton Papers* still acts as the main reference work and is the origin of the commonly cited statistic that sixty-three pamphlets comprised the debate. However, Dunbar's cataloguing method is opaque and his book has troubling omissions, especially in regards to how material was compiled together and differences between editions of the same title.<sup>7</sup> A recent project has a much more sensitive approach to the materiality of the Paxton Boys texts. The Digital Paxton project aims to create a critical edition of texts. The project enables users to access high-quality scans for free. The project connects 1764 texts to relevant manuscripts and documents from throughout Pennsylvanian history to understand the rise and legacy of the Paxton Boys.<sup>8</sup> By contrast, my catalogue focuses solely upon texts produced in 1764. It was put together to categorise, count, and, where possible, establish a chronology of Paxton Boys texts. I include the catalogue as an appendix to clarify some of the lingering uncertainty about the extent of the Paxton Boys pamphlets and so that scholars working on the topic can contribute their own discoveries to the ongoing work in the Paxton Boys archive. Alongside the conclusions from the catalogue, the article will also use analytical bibliography methods to describe the materiality of the texts. The similarities and differences between Paxton Boys prints reveal insights into the social world in which audiences encountered the words on the page. Enumerative and analytical bibliography focuses attention on the materiality of the Paxton Boys debate to demonstrate that both verbal and non-verbal elements of the text affected interpretation.

Furthermore, these 'non-verbal' elements are central to the book history perspective on the events of 1764. Non-verbal is a broad term that includes, among other things, the use of images, stylistic issues such as space and typography, editorial decisions about compiling texts together, and the social and political context of a text's publication. Together with a close reading of the text and its paratexts, this holistic view of the Paxton Boys debate helps to explore the political implications of the print medium. Throughout 1764, debates initiated in the State House were put out into the streets through printed texts. These texts broadened the audience for the debate and allowed for greater participation, but the texts also brought the debate into the remit of print professionals, many of whom then further polarised the

---

<sup>7</sup> See: *Cloven-Foot Discovered* and *A Battle! A Battle! A Battle of Squirt*, both of which will be discussed below. Dunbar, *Paxton Papers*, pp. 83 – 6, 173 – 82.

<sup>8</sup> *Digital Paxton: Archive, Critical Edition, and Teaching Platform* <http://digitalpaxton.org>, <accessed 1 November 2017>.

dispute. Yet, this need not have been the case. When the rioters met the Philadelphia delegation in early 1764, the hope on both sides was that a speedy resolution to western troubles could be found through formal government processes. The Paxton Boys dispersed because the delegation assured the rioters that the Assembly and Governor would hear their grievances. The Paxton Boys submitted these grievances in two parts. The first part was a declaration of loyalty written on 6 February, the eve of the negotiations with the Philadelphia delegation, that sought to explain away charges of riot and thereby evade the prosecutions that Governor John Penn threatened in an official proclamation from 2 January.<sup>9</sup> On 17 February, this declaration was tabled separately in the legislative House and the executive Provincial Council.<sup>10</sup> In the meantime, the Paxton Boys had written a remonstrance setting out a series of formal steps that the government should take to redress the depredations caused by white/Indian violence in western Pennsylvania.<sup>11</sup> The remonstrance was actually tabled ahead of the declaration in the House on 15 February and the Provincial Council on 14 February.<sup>12</sup> Initially, the energies of both the Paxton Boys and the Pennsylvania government concentrated on resolving the issue through formal channels.

Moreover, one of the first pamphlets to defend the actions of the Paxton Boys, *An Historical Account of the Late Disturbance*, also hoped for a formal resolution to the disruption in the province. The author wrote that the ‘Grievances by Information [of the Paxton Boys] is at length to be laid before the Honourable Governor, the House of Representatives, and undoubtedly from so just a Constitution will receive the just Merits of their Cause, which we hope in due Time will be made Manifest and openly publish’d.’<sup>13</sup> The anonymous author of *An Historical Account* asserted that though the Pennsylvanian government had been delinquent in protecting the western colonists, after formally submitting grievances, both the executive and legislative branches would work cooperatively to redress western Pennsylvanian troubles. The author was evidently conscious of the ongoing debate in the State House because the

---

<sup>9</sup> *Proclamation 2 January 1764* (Philadelphia), Archive of Americana, Early American Imprints, Series I: Evans, 1639 – 1800 number 9783, (hereafter Evans).

<sup>10</sup> Kenny, *Peaceable Kingdom Lost*, p. 163. *Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania*, ed. by Samuel Hazard, 10 vols (Harrisburg; Theo. Fenn & Co., 1852), IX, p. 142 (hereafter MPCP). Pennsylvania Province, *Votes and Proceedings of the House of the Representatives of the House of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall, 1764), Evans 9787, p. 47.

<sup>11</sup> Kenny outlines the contradictions and self-aggrandising claims among the varying version of these events. Kenny, *Peaceable Kingdom Lost*, pp. 161 – 3.

<sup>12</sup> MPCP, p. 138. *Votes and Proceedings*, p. 44.

<sup>13</sup> *An Historical Account of the Late Disturbance Between the Inhabitants of the Back Settlements of Pennsylvania and the Philadelphians* (Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, [1764]), Evans 9697, p. 6.

pamphlet seems to have been written before the Paxton Boys published their grievances. The latest event discussed in the text was 8 February, and the author said that the grievances were ‘to be laid’ suggesting that the author wrote after the Paxton Boys presented their declaration to the Governor on 6 February, but before the executive Provincial Council considered the remonstrance on 14 February. Significantly, the author was also content the government would reach a resolution that ‘in due Time’ would be made ‘Manifest and openly publish’d’.<sup>14</sup> The author deferred to the formal processes and trusted that the Pennsylvania constitution would function effectively and transparently. Most of the later texts would not share this same confidence. In fact, the disruption and discontent precipitated by the Paxton Boys debate led to the rise of the people out-of-doors as a significant political force in Pennsylvania leading up to the Revolution.<sup>15</sup>

Before analysing some of the specifics of print’s role in this political reorganisation, it is worth examining why texts had a leading role in determining the response to the Paxton Boys. The problem was that the Pennsylvania government failed to address the Paxton Boys issues in a timely manner because of recurrent political deadlock. The legislative assembly and the proprietary executive branch had repeatedly clashed over the rights and prerogatives of the other. Key pieces of the government’s response to the Paxton Boys became embroiled in this struggle. One of oldest disputes was the disagreement about the tax rate of proprietary lands. The disagreement delayed a supply bill for a large grant of money to pay for the defence of the western settlements. Financial support for military forces was a central grievance of the Paxton Boys in their remonstrance, and Paxton apologists used the delays as evidence of a conspiracy to preserve trade with the Indians.<sup>16</sup> Another political contest between the Assembly and Governor revolved around the power to appoint militia officers. Penn had initially asked the Assembly to draft the militia bill in order to repulse the threatened invasion, but after meeting with the Paxton Boys, the militia became a key component in protecting white communities in western Pennsylvania against Native American reprisals. Penn delayed the bill because he refused to grant the Assembly another prerogative power to appoint the officers.<sup>17</sup> These delays in the supply bill and the militia bill eroded trust in the functionality

---

<sup>14</sup> Kenny, *Peaceable Kingdom Lost*, p. 163. MPCP, pp. 138 – 142. *Votes and Proceedings*, pp. 44 – 6.

<sup>15</sup> Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors*, p. 226. Kenny, *Peaceable Kingdom Lost*, p. 202.

<sup>16</sup> See for example: [Hugh Williamson], *The Plain Dealer: Or Remarks Upon Quaker Politics in Pennsylvania Numb III To be Continued* (Philadelphia; [William Dunlap], 1764), Evans 9878, p. 15.

<sup>17</sup> Kenny, *Peaceable Kingdom Lost*, pp. 194 – 7.



of the Pennsylvania government, and suggests why authors were interested in opening the dispute to the people out-of-doors as an alternative forum for the Paxton Boys debate.

Even less formal processes were subject to the jealousies between the executive and the Assembly. Six days after the reading of the Paxton Boys' declaration, the Governor refused a joint session between the Assembly and the executive council to address the grievances. The Assembly intended for the meeting to address the 'false or mistaken Facts' that underpinned the discontent in Pennsylvania and proposed the joint session to coordinate legislative and executive responses. Penn claimed that the joint meeting contravened proper jurisdiction and so denied the session.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, the House sent home Matthew Smith and James Gibson, the two Paxton Boys who had signed their names on the remonstrance, without a public hearing to challenge their vision of western Pennsylvania. Moreover, the Governor's refusal to meet with the house divided the various grievances of the remonstrance between the executive council and the Assembly, preventing a coordinated approach to resolving the western tensions.<sup>19</sup> In fact, the one response to the Paxton Boys that actually addressed a specific grievance was a scalp bounty included as part of the declaration of war against the Delaware and Shawnee. However, Penn passed the bill unilaterally through the executive power to make proclamations.<sup>20</sup> The bounty expired in December 1764, and no colonist brought a scalp for payment so the issue did not require the Assembly's cooperation.<sup>21</sup> Longstanding difficulties between the Assembly and the Governor prevented effective responses to the Paxton Boys.

Although the Governor delayed bills that specifically addressed Paxton Boys grievances, the Assembly was also slow in responding to complaints surrounding the riots. Between 2 January and 11 September, western counties sent at least eighteen petitions to the Assembly. The Assembly directly connected these petitions to the Paxton Boys remonstrance and, in May, created a committee to collate the complaints. However, the committee did not report to the House until September. They distilled the complaints down into two questions to consider: whether the Pennsylvania charter guaranteed that every county should have four representatives and whether each county should have its own supreme court to

---

<sup>18</sup> *Votes and Proceedings*, (Philadelphia, 1764), pp. 50 – 1.

<sup>19</sup> *Votes and Proceedings*, pp. 50 – 2.

<sup>20</sup> *Proclamation 7 July 1764* (Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall, 1764), Evans 9784. MPCP, pp. 188 – 92.

<sup>21</sup> Henry J Young, 'A Note on Scalp Bounties', *Pennsylvania History*, 24:3 (1957), 207 – 18, (pp. 212 – 3).

facilitate easy access to justice. The House concluded two days later to defer the questions until after the annual October election.<sup>22</sup> Therefore, throughout 1764 there was no formal government response to the grievances raised publicly by the Paxton Boys in their published texts. Furthermore, the petitions reveal that the Pennsylvanian authorities faced increasingly vocal discontent about government representation. This lack of responsive government was not just a western concern, and on 29 February, during the opening salvos of the Paxton Boys debate, there was a separate petition from the people of Philadelphia asking the legislative assembly to open House proceedings to the public. The House rejected the petition on the grounds it was un-parliamentary.<sup>23</sup> Yet this petition for access to formal politics within the State House became a recurrent issue in Pennsylvanian politics throughout the American Revolution until the radical caucus of 1776 enshrined open legislative proceedings in the independent Pennsylvania Constitution.<sup>24</sup> Both the Philadelphia petition for opening the doors and the eighteen western petitions for increased access to governance reveal that the exchange of Paxton Boys texts took place against a backdrop of an ineffective government response and increasingly vocal discontent about open governance.

While processes stalled within the halls of the State House, events out-of-doors were being driven forward by texts. Three early texts set the inflammatory tone of the debate. On 30 January, before the Paxton Boys had reached Germantown, Benjamin Franklin's *A Narrative of the Late Massacre* condemned the Paxton Boys as 'CHRISTIAN WHITE SAVAGES'. Franklin's screed against the rioters established lawlessness and incivility as core elements of the anti-Paxton argument.<sup>25</sup> The Paxton Boys themselves argued that the Native Americans in Conestoga and Lancaster were enemies and thus their massacre was an act of loyalty to the King. They claimed the violent disorder had arisen because they had no legal means of redress. They also insinuated that the Quakers and their 'excessive Regard' for Native Americans perpetuated the conflict in western Pennsylvania.<sup>26</sup> The Paxton Boys published their

---

<sup>22</sup> *Votes and Proceedings*, p. 104.

<sup>23</sup> Gary Nash, *The Urban Crucible: Social Change, Political Consciousness, and the Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, MA; Harvard University Press, 1979), p. 528, n. 111. *Votes and Proceedings*, pp. 54, 57 – 8.

<sup>24</sup> Benjamin J. Carp, *Rebels Rising: Cities and the American Revolution* (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 194 – 195. *The Constitution of the Common-Wealth of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1776), Evans 14979, pp. 14 – 5.

<sup>25</sup> [Benjamin Franklin], *A Narrative of the Late Massacres in Lancaster County of a Number of Indians, Friends of this Province, by Persons Unknown* ([Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall], 1764), Evans 9667, p. 27.

<sup>26</sup> Mathew Smith, James Gibson, *A Declaration and Remonstrance of the Distressed and Bleeding Frontier Inhabitants of the Province of Pennsylvania* ([Philadelphia; William Bradford], 1764), Evans 9630, p. 4.

grievances as *A Declaration and Remonstrance of a Distressed and Bleeding Frontier* sometime after 17 February, at a similar time the House dismissed Smith and Gibson without a hearing. Days afterwards, Paxton apologist, David James Dove, expanded upon these grievances by explicitly blaming the Quakers in the Assembly. Dove claimed that the Quakers aimed only to enrich themselves at the expense of the western Pennsylvanians.<sup>27</sup> This conspiracy informed many later narratives that aimed to excuse the Paxton Boys' violent massacre of Native Americans and the riotous intimidation of Philadelphia. The Paxton apologists were ultimately more successful. They set the agenda for the debate by provoking anti-Paxton authors to write rejoinders.<sup>28</sup> They also roused sufficient discontent among the reading public that Penn felt incapable of pursuing the prosecution of the rioters.<sup>29</sup> These early incendiary texts were significant because they prompted a flurry of rejoinders that polarised the debate between Paxton apologists and their opponents.

Although the tone of the debate was scurrilous and divisive from the outset, both sides agreed that the violence of the rioters demonstrated a breakdown in Pennsylvanian governance. As commentators discussed this breakdown, they opened governmental structures out to public scrutiny, thereby increasing the reach of printed debate in deciding the response to the Paxton Boys. This is perhaps most visible in the campaign for royal government, which, like the publication of *Declaration and Remonstrance*, engaged audiences outside the State House. In March, the perceived breakdown of governance prompted the House to pass twenty-six resolves mainly condemning the actions of the provincial executive in delaying the supply bill and the militia bill. The resolves culminated in a resolution to consult Pennsylvanians during the House's recess on whether to petition Britain for a change in the Pennsylvania charter, transferring the powers of the proprietary Penn family over to royal appointments. Significantly, the resolutions were also ordered to be made public, in effect to accompany the petitioning campaign and justify the switch to royal government.<sup>30</sup> Franklin printed a hundred copies of the petition

---

<sup>27</sup> [David James Dove], *The Quaker Unmask'd; or, Plain Truth* (Philadelphia; [Andrew Steuart], 1764), Evans 9646, p. 13.

<sup>28</sup> Olson, 'The Pamphlet War over the Paxton Boys', p. 54.

<sup>29</sup> Spero, *Frontier Country*, pp. 165 – 6.

<sup>30</sup> *Votes and Proceedings*, p. 74.

for royal government at his own expense.<sup>31</sup> Franklin and the Assembly sought to resolve the political deadlock within the State House by appealing to the people out-of-doors for their assent in changing the government structure. They attempted to use printed texts to disrupt governmental blockages, but this move into printedness inflamed the rhetoric of the debate.

Their opponents sought to use print in a similar way. As equally frustrated over the direction of politics in-doors, opponents to royal government also appealed to the public through print. Assemblyman John Dickinson broke with established tradition in June by printing his dissenting opinion. Previously, proceedings were only published by order of the House. Dickinson's publication sparked another flurry of exchanges, particularly between Dickinson and Joseph Galloway. The exchange between the assemblymen quickly moved from a discussion of the merits of royal government into a disputation of the facts that preceded Franklin's petition peppered with numerous ad hominem attacks. This heightened concentration on personalities was closely associated with the move into printed debate. In fact, other opponents to royal government sought to undermine its main architect, Benjamin Franklin, by distributing a copy of a xenophobic 1755 essay. In the essay, Franklin fretted that as German immigrants 'swarmed' into the province these 'Palatine Boors', as he called them, threatened to overwhelm Pennsylvanian society.<sup>32</sup> Franklin's opponents went to coffee houses to share the damning essay with the German community. They claimed Franklin's comments demonstrated that he and his political allies would not protect the interests of German immigrants.<sup>33</sup> Opponents such as Hugh Williamson appended the offending passage as a footnote to an anti-Franklin poem.<sup>34</sup> And Christoph Saur included an unfavourable translation of Franklin in the German-language text *Getreue Warnung gegen Lockvögel*.<sup>35</sup> The

---

<sup>31</sup> [Benjamin Franklin], *The Petition of the Freeholders and Inhabitants of the Province of Pennsylvania [29 March 1764]* (Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall, 1764), *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, ed. by Leonard W. Labaree (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1967) (hereafter BFP), XI, pp. 145–147.

<sup>32</sup> Only the 1751 manuscript version of the essay and the 1755 Boston print contain the slur. When Franklin reprinted the document in Philadelphia in 1760, he removed the offending passages. Benjamin Franklin, 'Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind, 1751', BFP, IV, pp. 225–234. Benjamin Franklin, 'Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind, Peopling of Countries & c.' in William Clarke, *Observations on the Late and Present Conduct of the French* (Boston, 1755), Evans 7389, pp. 13–4. Benjamin Franklin, *The Interest of Great Britain Considered ... to which are added Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind* (Philadelphia, 1760), Evans 8600, p. 45.

<sup>33</sup> J. Philip Gleason, 'A Scurrilous Colonial Election and Franklin's Reputation', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 18:1 (1961), 68–84, (pp. 78–9).

<sup>34</sup> [Hugh Williamson], *What is Sauce for a Goose is also Sauce for a Gander* ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9879, p. 4.

<sup>35</sup> *Getreue Warnung gegen Lockvögel* (Philadelphia; [Henry Miller], 1764), Evans 9865, p. 10.

dispute over Franklin's intention behind the phrase 'Palatine Boors' caused another round of printed exchanges including unprecedented contributions in the German-language press. The publication of the slur lost Franklin his seat in the assembly in the October elections, but in November 1764, the House still appointed Franklin as Pennsylvania's agent in London. Again, Dickinson disappointed with politics indoors published his dissenting opinion, this time in the *Pennsylvania Journal* newspaper, which prompted another round of discussions about the legitimacy of the House's decision and the propriety of printing dissenting opinions.<sup>36</sup> In each case, the texts that animated this part of the discussion sought to influence government process by soliciting public approval.

The events of 1764 could suggest that the print medium was antagonistic to government authority, but Pennsylvania had a long-established political culture in which print had supported governance. Since 1714, the Assembly had used regular publication of the province's laws to fulfil William Penn's founding ideal of open and harmonious government.<sup>37</sup> And one of the earliest texts printed in response to the Paxton Boys, the Riot Act, was a literal instrument of state authority, and one of the few bills to be printed in its own right rather than as part of the annual publication of bills. On Friday 3 February, the Assembly debated a message from Penn expressing his concerns about ordering British troops to fire on the rioters. The Assembly ordered Joseph Galloway and John Dickinson to form a committee to draft a Pennsylvanian version of Britain's Riot Act. The bill moved quickly through the government. Galloway and Dickinson presented the draft that evening, the House passed it, and the Governor gave his assent, all in the same day. The Riot Act is an example of print intimately entwined with the exercise of state authority. The bill prescribed the language that authorities would use to disband riotous gatherings. The Assembly ordered the bill read in every Quarter Session, thereby extending their authority through a print instrument to the practice of government throughout Pennsylvania. The day after the House passed the bill, the Governor read out the Riot Act to an assembled group of armed Philadelphians. The act of reading the bill legitimised the violence that Penn's armed volunteers threatened against the rioters.<sup>38</sup> While the Riot Act legitimised the exercise of state authority, the House

---

<sup>36</sup> *Pennsylvania Journal*, 1 November 1764.

<sup>37</sup> John Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers: The Making of a Creole Culture in Colonial Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, PA; University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), pp. 253 – 4.

<sup>38</sup> Henry Melchor Muhlenberg, *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, trans by Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Dobstein, 3 vols (Camden, MN; Picton Press, 1945), II, p. 18.

also curtailed the power of the printed bill. Galloway and Dickinson included an expiration clause for the following year, which was not part of the original 1714 act. In effect, this meant that the Assembly reserved to themselves the ability to renew the bill, requiring that the bill was refreshed by state authority annually.

Moreover, the bibliographic elements of the bill also reflected this same close connection with authority. The bill looked very different from the later public prints about the Paxton Boys. Foremost, the bill was printed in folio. A format that was larger, and therefore more expensive, than the octavo format used in many other Paxton texts. This choice of folio reflected the fact that the Riot Act followed a series of printing conventions for laws established over the course of the eighteenth century. The use of headings and space on the first page of the bill matched identically the other bills printed in the same year. The use of paragraphs and capitals to signal the various clauses of the bill followed customary patterns. Italics indicated the bill's title, place names, and the formal procedures for passing the bill like '*Signed by Order of the House*' or '*By his Honour's Command*'. These typographical choices were used in the same way in the bills printed as part of that year's publication of laws passed in the province.<sup>39</sup> The presentation of the page through bibliographic elements of type and space has an expressive capacity that should not be disregarded.<sup>40</sup> The printers of the Riot Act connected the bill to other instruments of the state through these shared print conventions and, by extension, indicated that it shared the same authority.

If print could be used as an instrument of state authority, then it could also subvert that same authority. This is perhaps most visible in the often overlooked broadside burlesque, *To the Commissioners and Assessors of Chester County*. The piece was a short poem that supported the Assembly efforts to raise taxation for the defence of western Pennsylvania. The central argument was that rich people would avoid tax when possible. This was an implicit indictment of the Penn family about the disputes over the taxation of proprietary lands that had delayed the Assembly supply bill. While these arguments thematically align the poem with many other Paxton texts, the form of the broadside most clearly indicates that it aimed to intervene in the 1764 debate. The broadside parodied Pennsylvania's newly

---

<sup>39</sup> *Anno Regni Georgii III* (Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall, 1764), Evans 9780.

<sup>40</sup> D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 12 – 17.

introduced self-assessment tax form. In May 1764, after months wrangling with the governor about the rate of proprietary taxation, the House passed a bill granting £55,000 to protect against ‘barbarous invasions’ of Native Americans in western Pennsylvania.<sup>41</sup> As part of the bill, the House introduced a new taxation form that listed twenty-five categories of taxable income. *To the Commissioners* used this form to structure the poem visually. In response to each of the categories, the author asserted they did not receive that income, in effect demonstrating that poor people could not contribute substantially; therefore, the Assembly’s supply bill rested mainly on rich people assessing their wealth for these categories accurately. As a demonstration of state authority, the back of the official form had an endorsement that threatened tax cheats with fines worth four times the amount owed if they were dishonest in their assessment. Although the poem supported more taxation, the author subverted the new tax form, an instrument of state power, to critique the effectiveness of self-assessed tax. The Riot Act and *To the Commissioners* conveyed their message through print conventions; in fact, they used the same rhetorical technique with each imitating other printed documents to support their individual purposes. These two examples suggest that printing conventions played an important role in guiding how audiences interpreted the text.

Unlike the Riot Act and *To the Commissioners*, the link between the written content and the printed object was not always so well-aligned. Another overlooked Paxton Boys text, the *Universal Peace Maker*, exemplifies how tension between the words on the page and the physical form, i.e. verbal and non-verbal elements, can undermine the authority of the text. *Universal Peace Maker* was a jeremiad on the divisions within Pennsylvania. The author, under the pseudonym Philanthropos, warned that civil disunion had led to the demise of biblical Judea, classical Rome, and contemporary Europe. They attributed this disunion to the way that pride disrupted the social hierarchy by causing people to pursue their own private interests. Proud elites were unresponsive to their constituents because they protected their wealth. Meanwhile, ‘Some of the most contemptible creatures [...] yet think themselves sufficient to direct Statesmen, dictate to Legislators, and teach Doctors and Divines.’<sup>42</sup> Philanthropos implied that those who had little experience in governing should not be so ‘puffed up with a pride’ as to interfere in social affairs

---

<sup>41</sup> James T. Mitchell and Henry Flanders, eds, *The Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania from 1682 to 1801*, 18 vols (Harrisburg, PA; William Stanley Ray, 1899), VI, p. 344.

<sup>42</sup> *Universal Peace-Maker; or a Modern Author's Instructor* (Philadelphia, Anthony Armbruster, 1764), Evans 9797, p. 6.

without the wisdom to recognise how to benefit the common weal. These authors were either, if they were powerful, enriching themselves at the expense of civil union, or if they were of the lower sort, arrogantly quarrelling and escalating party politics in the province. The piece used allusive language throughout and never invoked the Paxton Boys directly; however, the subtitle, *Modern Author's Instructor*, indicated that Philanthropos blamed 'THE Divisions which of late have prevailed, and are still subsisting' on the authors of other recently published texts. *Universal Peace Maker* challenged the idea that public prints were an appropriate place to debate provincial politics.

The key to unpacking the references in *Universal Peace Maker* and understand its critique of public debate is to look at the 25 March 1764 publication date. During March, there was a febrile exchange of texts that escalated the Paxton Boys debate. Authors published texts to support or refute the earliest publications like *Narrative of the Late Massacres*, *A Declaration and Remonstrance*, and *Quaker Unmask'd*. Most notably, Thomas Barton published *Conduct of the Paxton Men*, a direct refutation of Franklin's *Narrative* on 17 March. *Conduct of the Paxton Men* synthesised evidence from western colonists with the conspiratorial argument from Dove. Barton asserted that Quakers had only 'pretended Scruples' against violence and claimed they frustrated government because of 'Obstinacy and Love of worldly Power'. He supported his argument with depositions and material he said the Paxton Boys were circulating around Pennsylvania.<sup>43</sup> Meanwhile, two rejoinders to Dove's *Quaker Unmask'd* worked against Barton's argument. *Remarks on a Quaker Unmask'd* directly refuted both Dove's positive characterisations of the Paxton Boys and his allegations against the Quakers while also praising Franklin's *Narrative* for its impartiality. *Remarks* discussed the merits of other texts more than it tackled the issue of the Paxton Boys.<sup>44</sup> A *Quaker Vindicated* continued in much the same vein. It was a point by point refutation of *Quaker Unmask'd*.<sup>45</sup> The *Universal Peace Maker* never took an explicit stand for or against the Paxton Boys, instead arguing that the debate itself caused the disharmony in Pennsylvania as authors pursued their own private interests by

---

<sup>43</sup> [Thomas Barton], *The Conduct of the Paxton-Men Impartially Represented* (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9594, p. 16.

<sup>44</sup> *Remarks on The Quaker Unmask'd; or Plain Truth Found to be Plain falshood* [sic] (Philadelphia; John Morris, [1764]), Evans 9813.

<sup>45</sup> *The Quaker Vindicated; or, Observations on a Late Pamphlet Entitled, The Quaker unmask'd, or, Plain Truth* (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9805.



writing against each other. *Universal Peace Maker* questioned the political legitimacy of a printed debate, but the anonymous author had no other recourse than another printed intervention.

Thinking about *Universal Peace Maker* as a material text provides more insight into the tension between the print medium and Philanthropos' argument. The author relied on the fact that distributors circulated the text in March 1764 and in so doing associated the criticisms with the flurry of texts debating the response to the Paxton Boys. The date of its publication was necessary context for identifying the 'Modern Authors' in the subtitle. The date also helped its readers appreciate the urgency of the warning because it situated the jeremiad in the midst of a heated exchange of texts. However, the physical form of *Universal Peace Maker* weakened the force of Philanthropos' criticisms. Unlike the Riot Act, the text was not printed in a large format according to established printing conventions that associated it with sources of state authority. *Universal Peace Maker* was fifteen pages and printed in octavo, and as such, it looked like many of the other pieces that contributed to the debate about the Paxton Boys. For example, the first edition of *Quaker Unmask'd* and *Quaker Vindicated* were each sixteen-page octavo editions, while *Remarks on a Quaker Unmask'd* was an eight-page octavo and *Conduct of the Paxton Men* was a thirty-six page octavo. *Universal Peace Maker* set itself apart from the destructive Paxton Boys debate by eschewing direct references and Philanthropos instead relied on the circulation of the printed object to instil meaning into the essay's words, but the octavo format associated the essay with the very texts it sought to condemn. Ultimately, the print medium both supported and undermined aspects of the argument in *Universal Peace Maker*.

Analytical bibliography helps to investigate this tension between words and printed form by focusing our attention on what Stuart Hall called the professional code. The professional code was part of Hall's encoding/decoding model of mass communication. In the model, authors encoded signals into a message that audiences decoded. Hall was interested in studying how the use of different codes, in either the encoding or decoding process, could affect meaningful communication. On the decoding side, audiences might challenge or subvert the preferred meaning on the author. On the encoding side, Hall argued that technical practices involved in the means of communication affected how audiences decoded the message. Hall said the signals associated with this intervening step between the original author and the

intended recipient were part of a professional code. The professional code mainly involved the practical considerations of turning manuscript into print and he suggested that professionals tended to work within the preferred meaning of the authors, but crucially, these professional signals did not necessarily align with the author's preferred meaning, such that the professional code could actually undermine the author's message.<sup>46</sup> Hall's concentration on the significance of the material means of communication is particularly important for book historians because it helps us to understand more about how the print medium affected the development of the Paxton Boys debate. It highlights the fact that audiences decoded signals from both the author and the printer that may have affected their interpretation of the ideas within texts.

The encoding/decoding model asks scholars to contrast the signals from the author against the signals from the print professionals, but it can be difficult, in some cases impossible, to distinguish between the various encoders. This task is even more complicated in the Paxton Boys debate because most authors and printers published work anonymously. Eighty-seven pamphlets either included no name or else used a pseudonym. Meanwhile, seventy-five titles had no information about the printer, including seven with false imprints. Fortunately, work by bibliographic scholars in attributing authors and printers to texts has been helpful in this regard. Fifteen authors have been attributed to otherwise anonymous work and sixty-three printers have been attributed to unsigned pieces. Overall, out of the hundred and nine Paxton Boys editions, seventy-two texts have unknown authors and twelve texts have unknown printers. This double anonymity is a reminder that audiences encountered the Paxton Boys debate through holistic texts, in which the words on the page and the physical form of the book constituted a single decoding task. The book historian, though, has the critical distance to interpret texts in a more granular way.

One way to parse the different encoders in a text is to look at characteristic aspects of print. The vitriolic tone of the Paxton Boys debate was a key factor in contributing to the disruptive fallout from the debate. Compiling discrete texts together under a single title is a distinctive printing practice which had a

---

<sup>46</sup> Stuart Hall, 'Encoding/Decoding', *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972 – 79*, ed by Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Lowe, and Paul Willis (London; Routledge, 1996), pp. 128 – 38.

major effect on the tone of each of the elements within an edition. One of the most comprehensive compilations was Isaac Hunt's collected anti-Paxton works, which brought together five separate titles of which three have survived as independent editions. The compilation allowed a single text to present distinct perspectives while the juxtaposition imparted the semblance of coherence to the ideas. The first title, 'Looking Glass Numb I', was a refutation of the argument in *Quaker Unmask'd* that the Presbyterians expressed their loyalty through violence against Native Americans. Instead, for Hunt, Presbyterians had opposed each of the British monarchs since Charles I and the Paxton Boys were a continuation of this legacy. Hunt brought his narrative of anti-monarchical Presbyterians up to date in 'Looking Glass Numb II'. In this piece, Hunt argued that the Presbyterians had joined forces with the Proprietors to protect their mutual interests; the proprietors aimed to resist the Assembly's taxation and the Presbyterians wanted to become an established religion receiving an income from taxation.<sup>47</sup>

The three other titles in the compendium then provided satirical justification for these claims. 'The Substance of a Council' purported to record the minutes of the Presbyterian annual synod in which John Elder, the leading Presbyterian in Paxton, argued for increased political cooperation along confessional lines to lower Proprietary taxation and establish Presbyterians as the official religion. In 'A Dialogue between a Churchman in the Country and a Presbyterian in the City', Hunt rehearsed the arguments for and against royal government with the Anglican Churchman revealing the inconsistencies in the Presbyterian case through the course of the dialogue. Finally, 'A Letter from a Gentleman in Transilvania' was an allegorical re-telling of the Paxton Boys massacre in a fictional eastern European state. In Hunt's version of events, the Waywode, or Governor, betrayed the Delegates, i.e. the Assembly, by allying with the Piss-Brute-tarians, i.e. the Paxton Boys. Each text clearly contributed to Hunt's argument that the Presbyterians aimed to establish themselves as the official religion.<sup>48</sup> The Paxton Boys were simply the most blatant example yet attempted in Pennsylvania. The *Looking Glass* compendium brought political polemic together with scurrilous insinuation, a pedantic dialogue, and a satirical counterfeit. Hunt's compilation is a reminder that audiences encountered texts that ran the gamut from scatological humour to earnest disputation. Print accommodated these tonal shifts within the pages of a

---

<sup>47</sup> [Isaac Hunt], *A Looking Glass for Presbyterians* ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1744 [1764]), Evans 9703.

<sup>48</sup> Hunt, *A Looking Glass for Presbyterians*.

single text and though the full implications of these discordant elements is difficult to discern, each text underscored the vitriol of the surrounding pieces adding further to the divisive rhetoric of the Paxton Boys debate.

While Hunt brought together bespoke pieces to make his argument, compilation could also adapt older works for new purposes. For example, the poem *Cloven-Foot Discovered* was appended to the end of *A Letter to Batista Angeloni*. *Letter* was a reprint of English satirist John Shebbeare's 1756 *Letters on the English Nation, by Batista Angeloni*. Shebbeare's pamphlet was a satirical look at English mores from the perspective of a visiting Italian Jesuit. The excerpt reprinted in 1764 criticised the Quakers for their levelling spirit and their supposed monopolies in trade, themes that were relevant for the Paxton Boys debate. However, the producer of the pamphlet then appended the poem *Cloven-Foot Discovered* that explicitly addressed the Paxton Boys march. The poem alleged that the Quakers enriched themselves at the expense of the western colonists by selling guns and materiel to the Native Americans without caring that this trade helped the Indians wage war on the white colonists. As in the Paxton Boys texts generally, *Cloven-Foot Discovered* continued many of the same points that Dove had raised in *Quaker Unmask'd* about the hypocrisy of Quaker governance. The poem also concluded with a short stanza that praised the violence of the Paxton Boys for resisting the Native Americans, a passage which echoed the Paxton Boys' own justification for the massacre in *Declaration and Remonstrance*.<sup>49</sup> Simply reprinting the original *Letter* in 1764 would have extended Shebbeare's comments on the Quakers to Pennsylvania, but adding *Cloven-Foot* as a coda reinforced that same message. This act of re-framing and re-appropriating other texts is another important element of compilation that again highlights the most divisive elements in both *Letter* and *Cloven-Foot*.

*Looking Glass* and *Letter* would seem to suggest that compilations were the product of a single creative force, but, significantly for understanding the professional code, compilation could involve multiple parties encoding signals into the same text. In the two surviving editions of *A Battle! A Battle! A Battle of Squirt*, the printers, Anthony Armbruster and Andrew Steuart, produced two significantly

---

<sup>49</sup> *A Letter, from Batista Angeloni [...] To which is Added, The Cloven-Foot Discovered* (Carolina [Philadelphia, 1764]), Evans 9838.

different compilations. The core text resembled Hunt's *Looking Glass*. It was a series of three poems that aimed to demonstrate a thesis similar to Dove's that the Quaker peace testimony disguised self-interest. The first poem, the eponymous *A Battle! A Battle!*, focused on the supposed hypocrisy of the Quakers refusing to fund a militia to fight the French only a few years earlier during the Seven Years War, but then taking up arms and storing weapons in the Meeting House to repulse the Paxton Boys with violence. As alleged in *Quaker Unmask'd*, the author supposed Quakers had done so to protect the Indian trade. The author insisted that the Paxton Boys acted with the utmost decorum and dispersed after the Philadelphia elites promised to redress their grievances about the Indian violence in western Pennsylvania. Meanwhile, 'The Quaker Address, Versify'd' was a satirical versification of *The Address of the People Call'd Quakers* that had been published in February. The original Quaker Address complained that the Paxton Boys' *Declaration and Remonstrance* aimed to 'render us [Quakers] odious to our Superiors, and to keep up a tumultuous Spirit among the inconsiderate Part of the People'.<sup>50</sup> The satirical poem subverted this document by adopting the persona of a Quaker to continue this line of argument disingenuously. The poem made clear that the motivation of the Quakers was to hold on to political power for the emoluments of the various positions. In the final poem, 'King Wampum', the author accused the prominent Quaker Israel Pemberton of perverting the stated intentions of his Friendly Society, which was a private organisation of Quakers who met with Native Americans to attempt peaceful reconciliation. The poem alleged Pemberton used the society as a cover to pursue sex with a pregnant Native American. According to the poem, Pemberton had sex with the woman, but she in turn stole his gold pocket watch. The moral at the end of the poem declared that in pursuing his own interests Pemberton had justly hurt himself.<sup>51</sup> Not only were the poems similar in their themes, they also had the same poetic form of rhyming couplet with eight syllables in a line. This shared aesthetic gave the pamphlet an internal coherence. Collectively the poems repeat many of the Paxton apologists claims about the motivations of the Quakers, but by separating out the poems, the text collected together three mutually reinforcing perspectives.

---

<sup>50</sup> Society of Friends, *The Address of the People Call'd Quakers, in the Province of Pennsylvania, to John Penn, Esquire, Lieutenant-Governor of the said Province* (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9670, p. 3.

<sup>51</sup> *A Battle! A Battle! A Battle of Squirt; Where no Man is Kill'd, and no Man is Hurt!* ([Philadelphia, Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9595.

Despite the cohesiveness of *A Battle!*, the two extant editions have significant differences. Firstly, there is a difference in the titles of the two works. Armbruster's edition was titled *A Battle! A Battle! A Battle of Squirt*, while Steuart's was *A Battle! A Battle! A Battle A Squirt*. More importantly, Steuart's edition made additions and deletions that further emphasised the inflammatory elements of the argument. In Armbruster's edition, 'Quaker Address Versify'd' had a short coda called the School Boy's reply. In the original address to Penn, the Quakers claimed a young boy started the rumour that in February 1764 the Quakers hid Native American warriors from the Paxton Boys delegation inspecting the Philadelphia barracks that had housed the Indian refugees. In *A Battle!*, the putative Young Boy defended himself in a short stanza. However, the Steuart edition excised this stanza and replaced it with a note that the additional material was '*too horrid even for the Dove's Quill*'. Steuart's note suggested that the editor had cut scurrilous material written by the Quakers. This deletion asked the reader to consider material that was even more scurrilous than 'Quaker Address Versify'd', which was already an incendiary poem. Moreover, Steuart's use of 'Dove' in the note referred to the Quaker's peace testimony as well as to another addition Steuart had made to the text. In the front matter of the pamphlet, Steuart included a woodcut of a hook-nosed person, with the implication it was a Quaker, and framed it with a verse from Henry Fielding's play *The Tragedy of Tragedies*. The excerpt asked the devil for the power to be scurrilous and it had been adapted for the Pennsylvania edition to include the word 'Dove'.<sup>52</sup> Each of Steuart's adaptations reinforced the central message, but in a way that was distinct from Armbruster's edition. Print's capacity to present diverse perspectives under the same cover is a distinctive quality of printed debate. Crucially, in the cases above, these alternative perspectives were not truthful or conciliatory, but bogus and inflammatory.

Steuart's compilation complicates issues surrounding authorship in the Paxton Boys texts, especially since the text was published anonymously and written anonymously. The woodcut in *A Battle!* suggests that printers made autonomous decisions regarding the content of the texts in the Paxton Boys debate. Steuart used the same woodcut in both the pro-Paxton *A Battle!* and the anti-Paxton *The Squabble*. The woodcut itself was from a 1762 satirical title *Nosum Nosurum* that Steuart also published. Probably specially made for the pamphlet, *Nosum Nosurum*'s woodcut depicted two men in profile. One with a large

---

<sup>52</sup> *A Battle! A Battle! A Battle a Squirt; Where no Man is Kill'd, and no Man is Hurt!* (Germantown [Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764]), Evans 9596.

hooked nose facing another man with a smaller nose. Through an address to the reader and new lyrics to the tune of the Jolly Bacchanal, *Nosum Nosurum* implied that the Quaker insistence on humility disguised prideful self-assurance.<sup>53</sup> The author made many of the same accusations that Paxton apologists levelled at the Quakers two years later. In all three cases, the hooked-nose individual was the target of the satire, but the religious association of the target changed between pamphlets. When Steuart reused the image in the anti-Paxton *Squabble*, Steuart labelled the hooked-nose individual as ‘THYRSIS with a Pr\*sb\*t\*rian Nose’, then contrasted it directly against a man with a smaller nose labelled as ‘CORIN, with a Q\*\*k\*ronian Nose.’<sup>54</sup> In effect reversing the characterizations made in *Nosum Nosurum*. Steuart split the woodcut in half and only used the large-nose image when he included it a third time in the pro-Paxton *A Battle!*. Finally, Steuart framed the image with text mocking the Quakers for taking up arms against the Paxton Boys.<sup>55</sup> For both of the 1764 usages, Steuart's edition directly competed with another by Armbruster that did not contain the images and so the woodcut may have been more appealing to the reading audience. In each case though, Steuart's addition of the woodcut highlighted the damning characterisation of the author, contributing to the polarising and divisive tone of the debate.

Printers could also include ornaments to the same effect. In many cases, the addition of printer's ornaments was neutral and filled otherwise empty space. However, some figures could affect the preferred meaning of the author. For example, Henry Miller used the same woodcut of Mercury at the end of *Eine Neue Anrede* and *Der Lockvögel Warnungsgesang*. The two pieces respond to *Getreue Warnung gegen Lockvögel*, an anti-Franklin piece opposing his re-election.<sup>56</sup> Both pieces discuss Franklin's ‘Palatine Boors’ comment. *Eine Neue Anrede* lamented the divisions being sown among the German population. *Der Lockvögel Warnungsgesang*, through a series of question and answers, focused on the way the proprietors diminished the liberties of the Pennsylvanian people. At the end of each text, Miller inserted a woodcut of Mercury with a banner above a cannon firing on a fortified British town. In *Eine Neue Anrede*, the banner

<sup>53</sup> *Nosum Nosurum: Or A New Treatise on Large Noses* (Philadelphia; [Andrew Steuart], 1762), Evans 9223.

<sup>54</sup> *A Battle! A Battle! A Battle A Squirt; Where no Man is Kill'd, and no Man is Hurt!* (Germantown [Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764]), Evans 9596. Agricola, *The Squabble: A Pastoral Eclogue [...] from the First Edition* (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, [1764]), Evans 9565.

<sup>55</sup> Olson incorrectly identified this as a distinct cartoon targetting Dove. Olson, ‘The Pamphlet War over the Paxton Boys’, p. 36.

<sup>56</sup> *Getreue Warnung gegen Lockvögel* (Philadelphia; [Henry Miller], 1764), Evans 9865.

was blank, but in *Der Lockvögel Warnungsgesang*, Miller inserted the phrase ‘Vivat Rex’.<sup>57</sup> The origins of the woodcut are unclear. Elizabeth Reilly’s dictionary of colonial ornaments listed only the ornament from *Eine Neue Anrede*, though given the subject matter it is likely the piece originated in prints from the Seven Years War.<sup>58</sup> The meaning in each 1764 case had a similar point: a sense the German speakers were British and besieged. In *Eine Neue Anrede*, the cannon alluded to the divisions introduced among Pennsylvania’s loyal German population. The woodcut conveyed the same meaning in *Der Lockvögel Warnungsgesang*, while the addition of ‘Vivat Rex’ continued a motif from other pamphlets that represented royal government as a loyal duty to the King. Miller’s ornaments are suggestive that printers had a degree of autonomy in encoding signals into texts for audiences to decode. Crucially, in the Paxton Boys debate, many of these additions highlighted acrimonious elements of the authors’ arguments.

Steuart and Miller’s woodcuts resonate with another distinctive element of the Paxton Boys prints. The 1764 debate was notable for the profusion of graphic satire that it inspired. Printers published seven bespoke cartoons in response to the dispute.<sup>59</sup> These cartoons are further evidence of the debate’s significance in the history of printing and, like Steuart’s woodcut and Miller’s ornaments, they existed in complex intertextual relationships with each other and many other texts. For example, the cartoon *The Paxton Expedition* addressed itself explicitly to the anti-Paxton poem *The Paxton Boys, A Farve*. Both pieces focused on the shambolic defence of Philadelphians against the rioters. The cartoon depicted the armed volunteers who prepared to repulse the rioters, while the poem mocked the Philadelphians for protecting ‘some Indians who never were true’. The poem referenced the farcical moment in which some defenders confused a group of mounted butchers for the Paxton rioters and panic ensued.<sup>60</sup> *The Paxton Boys, A Farve* also referenced the butcher debacle, but concluded with a threat that even though the defence was disorganised, the Philadelphians would kill the rioters.<sup>61</sup> Cartoons also spoke directly to each other. *The Election, A Medley* was a series of new lyrics to familiar tunes that condemned the Presbyterians and the

<sup>57</sup> *Eine Neue Anrede an die Deutschen in Philadelphia Caunty* (Philadelphia, [Henry Miller], 1764), Evans 9747. *Der Lockvögel Warnungsgesang vor den Stossvögeln* ([Philadelphia; Henry Miller], 1764), Evans 9713.

<sup>58</sup> Elizabeth Reilly, *Dictionary of Colonial American Printer’s Ornaments and Illustrations* (Worcester, MA; American Antiquarian Society, 1975), p. 1036.

<sup>59</sup> William Murrell includes the woodcut in *A Battle!*, but, as discussed above, the image was from an earlier pamphlet. William Murrell, *A History of American Graphic Humor*, 2 vols (New York; Whitney Museum of American Art, 1933), I, pp. 12 – 20.

<sup>60</sup> *The Paxton Expedition; Inscribed to the Author of the Farve* ([Philadelphia, 1764]), Evans 9627.

<sup>61</sup> *The Paxton Boys, A Farve* ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9776.



Paxton rioters. *Election* was directly refuted by another cartoon *The Counter-Medley*, which included new lyrics to familiar tunes and a similar, but bespoke, image of the election outside the Court House.<sup>62</sup> The images became even more reliant on intertextuality in the relationship between *A Conference between the Devil and Dove* and *An Addition to the Epitaph, without the Copper-Plate*. *Addition* asked readers to use the same image of Dove and the Devil in its own excoriation of Dove.<sup>63</sup> More work needs to be done on the history of these images, their production and reception, but suffice here to say, that the novelty of such a prolific production of cartoons focused on the most polarising and divisive elements of the debate.

Thus far, analysis of the professional code has concentrated on the materiality of the texts themselves, but these hundred and nine editions are important because they are artefacts of a broader social world. These texts helped document the Paxton Boys debate, but texts are only physical remnants of the ideas that changed Pennsylvania. Therefore, to understand how the Paxton Boys debate developed outside the State House in the public prints then we need to look at the personal influence of print professionals on the signals within texts that audiences decoded. Significantly, the Paxton Boys debate took place in a very specific printed forum, namely in free-standing texts. The same level of vitriol was not replicated in the newspapers. This was likely due to the influence of the printers of the newspapers. There were three newspapers published in Pennsylvania in 1764: Franklin and Hall's *Pennsylvania Gazette*, William Bradford's *Pennsylvania Journal*, and Henry Miller's *Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote*. A discussion of the editorial policy of newspapers would be an article in its own right, but the pamphlet *Last Tuesday* provides a tantalising insight into newspaper as a print genre with its own conventions. *Last Tuesday* was part of the debate between John Dickinson and Joseph Galloway about the House speeches in favour of Royal Government. Dickinson alleged that Galloway attempted to publish a certificate signed by Assembly men averring that Dickinson never gave his speech in the Assembly; however, according to *Last Tuesday*, the unnamed newspaper printer would not print it without first showing it to Dickinson. Galloway refused the printer's request and took the certificate away, publishing it instead as a broadside

---

<sup>62</sup> *The Election a Medley, humbly inscribed, to Squire Lilliput Professor of Scurrillity* ([Philadelphia, 1764]), Evans 9650. *The Counter-Medley being a Proper Answer to all the Dunces of the Medly and their Abettors* ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764]), Evans 9943.

<sup>63</sup> *A Conference between the D---l and Doctor D--e: Together with the Doctor's Epitaph on Himself* ([Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764]), Evans 9617. *The Addition to the Epitaph without the Copper-Plate* ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764]), Evans 9645

on 29 September titled *To the Public*. The newspaper forum did not tolerate the ad hominem attacks that circulated in the freestanding texts, an editorial policy hinted at in the poem *Advertisement, and not a Joke*. The poem was a scurrilous indictment of Franklin and Galloway. Significantly, the postscript claimed ‘*Intended for this Week’s News-Papers, but forgot to be put in.*’<sup>64</sup> *Advertisement* was unlike anything printed in the newspapers in 1764, so the postscript was probably satirical. And while situating the piece in the chronology of the Paxton Boys debate is difficult because it was undated, it would seem to be a reference to the dispute surrounding *Last Tuesday*. These two pieces are suggestive that newspapers were hostile to the vitriolic tone that characterised the debate generally.

Armbruster and Steuart were the most prolific printers of freestanding Paxton Boys texts. Thirty-nine editions of Paxton Boys material has been attributed to the press of Armbruster and nineteen editions to Steuart. Meanwhile, the three closest competitors, incidentally the printers of newspapers, printed between ten and eleven each, usually focusing on one issue. So Henry Miller printed ten editions mainly relating to the translation of ‘Palantine Boors’. Meanwhile, William Bradford printed eleven titles focusing largely on the royal versus proprietary government question and the shop of Benjamin Franklin and David Hall concentrated on defending Franklin. As such, the careers of Armbruster and Steuart provide vital clues about the role of the printer in the Paxton Boys debate. The printers existed in professional networks that demonstrate the entanglement of commercial and political contexts in the professional code. Most notably, the financial and material support for print shops bedded both men into economic and social relationships that extended across the Atlantic.

Steuart was part of an Irish printing network. He was born in Ulster and learned the trade as an apprentice to James Magee, one of the most important printers in Belfast. In 1758, Steuart emigrated to Philadelphia. In America, Steuart joined another of Magee’s apprentices, Hugh Gaine, who had already set up shop in New York in 1745. Steuart maintained a lifelong association with the Magee network. When Steuart moved to Wilmington, North Carolina, at the end of 1764, he left his print shop in the care of Magee’s brother Thomas, and when Steuart died in 1769, Thomas was the executor for Steuart’s estate. Throughout his working life, Steuart sold James Magee’s cheap Irish reprints of English texts. In arguing

---

<sup>64</sup> *Advertisement and Not a Joke* ([Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall, 1764]), Evans 9562.

for the significance of the Belfast trade, Michael O'Connor contends that the working association with Magee was more than just an opportunity to trade books, the Belfast editions resonated with the growing Ulster demographic in Pennsylvania.<sup>65</sup> Stuart's association with broader printing networks potentially encoded the Paxton Boys texts with signals that could affect the author's preferred meaning. For example, Stuart printed Barton's *Conduct of the Paxton Men* on 17 March, and to emphasise the significance of the publication date, the piece concluded with a dedication to the Irish patron saint St Patrick. How far did Stuart's name on the title page associate the text with this Belfast network? Or turning to another text, what effect did Stuart's name have on the fourth edition of *A Serious Address*? On that particular edition, Stuart appended to the end of the piece *A Dialogue between Andrew Trueman and Thomas Zealot*, which was an anti-Paxton poem that mocked Irish accents. Did Stuart's Irish association ameliorate the derisive patois? Ultimately, the extent to which audiences decoded the significance of the printer's ethnicity is difficult to discern, but, as Hall emphasised himself, the professional code reflected the social and material world around the texts, and as such, it preserves vital clues about the development of the debate.

Similarly, Anthony Armbruster's printing was envisioned as an important contribution to the German community in Pennsylvania. Armbruster had been an apprentice to Franklin, and like the other printers in that network, being one of Franklin's printers carried with it some of the master's own political agenda. Armbruster was actually the third apprentice that Franklin had taken on to address German issues in Pennsylvania. The two other apprentices were also active in the Paxton Boys debate. William Dunlap had printed five Paxton Boys editions, and Henry Miller had printed ten Paxton Boys texts with eight in German. As Franklin argued in his xenophobic 1755 essay, he was concerned that a demagogue could use a minority population, like the Germans, to undermine liberties in the province. Franklin wanted to print German-language texts to inculcate British values among German speakers. As such, Franklin's Society for the Relief and Instruction of Poor Germans provided the funds for Armbruster's press. Franklin's intention for the society, and for Armbruster, was twofold: firstly, to counteract the hold that another

---

<sup>65</sup> Michael O'Connor, "'A Small Cargoe for Tryal': Connections between the Belfast and Philadelphia Book Trades in the Later Eighteenth Century", in *Books between Europe and the Americas: Connections and Communities, 1620 - 1860*, ed by Leslie Howsam and James Raven (Houndsmill; Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 187 - 211.

German-language printer, Christoph Saur, exercised over the German community, and secondly, to break down the language barrier between English and German communities to remove the threat he perceived from the immigrant population.<sup>66</sup> Armbruster was part of an explicit attempt to use printing to put Franklin's political agenda into effect. Given their connection to these broader networks, the names of Steuart and Armbruster, affixed to title pages, were potentially a salient feature for readers decoding the texts.

Moreover, the Irish and German ethnicity of Steuart and Armbruster had a special resonance in the Paxton Boys debate. One of the successes of the Paxton apologists was the connection they established between the Scotch-Irish, especially recent Ulster immigrants, and the Pennsylvania Germans. As Peter Silver argued, the Paxton Boys debate was a key moment in re-defining ethnic boundaries. The Paxton apologists successfully demonstrated that white people had a common cause against Native Americans. Fighting Indian wars, both in fact and on paper, helped integrate white people from various European backgrounds together. German-language printing was significant in this re-alignment. Since the first wave of immigration, the Germans had been staunch allies of Franklin and the Assembly party, but Franklin's petition for royal government frightened German communities. They feared that a royal government would undermine their position in Pennsylvania by removing the Assembly's dependence on their support. Despite Franklin's repeated efforts to promote a more integrated print culture with German speakers reading Anglophone prints, prior to the Paxton Boys debate there had been a clear demarcation between the print cultures of the two language communities. In the course of the debate, German speakers found common cause with the predominantly western Pennsylvanian communities of Scotch-Irish through the Paxton Boys texts.<sup>67</sup> Translation, as a printing practice, thus became an important issue. Early German pamphlets followed many of the usual tropes. For example, *Eine Lustige Aria* concentrated on the indulgences given to the Indians and *Ein schön weltlich Lied* condemned Quaker government.<sup>68</sup> However, the debate over the phrase 'Palatine Boor' became a crucible for Franklin's commitment to the German community. Christoph Saur, Franklin's longstanding rival, put Franklin's

---

<sup>66</sup> Ralph Frasca, *Benjamin Franklin's Printing Network: Disseminating Virtue in Early America* (Columbia, MO; University of Missouri Press, 2006), pp. 109 – 14.

<sup>67</sup> Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors*, pp. 218 – 21.

<sup>68</sup> Hermann Wellenreuther, *Citizens in a Strange Land: A Study of German-American Broadides and their Meaning for Germans in North America, 1730 – 1830* (University Park, PA; Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013), pp. 211 – 3.

English passage beside a German version warning that Franklin and his allies disdained German people.<sup>69</sup> Meanwhile, Franklin's allies attempted to explain away the offending terms, but offered less convincing translations. Franklin and Galloway lost their seats because of the collapse of German support.<sup>70</sup> The Paxton Boys debate prompted the translation of material into German in a way that State House debates had never done and these translations contributed to a re-organisation of Pennsylvanian politics within-doors. Print professionals had an active role in fostering the vital integration between Germans and Scotch Irish communities by providing German-language texts for their audiences to engage with.

However, print professionals included more than just the printers themselves. A note at the end of the translation of Joseph Galloway's speech in favour of royal government made the distinction between the printer ['Buchdruckers'] and 'Herr Uebersesser [Übersetzer]', or Mr Translator. The printer apologised for the speed with which the text had been produced and the lack of polish in the book. Likewise, the translator apologised for any errors in the translation.<sup>71</sup> Henry Miller, sometimes known as Heinrich Müller, printed the speech and seven other German-language editions. Miller spoke fluent German and had learned his trade in Basel, Switzerland.<sup>72</sup> So while Miller could have translated the text himself, the note suggests that an unnamed translator was responsible for the translation. The translator was another person encoding signals into a text. Ideally, the translator worked according to a professional code that communicated the preferred meaning of the original author, but translation was a significant transformation that required a high-degree of autonomy on the part of the translator. Furthermore, not only was translation highly politicised, as seen above, but printed texts prominently told their readers the text was translated. The front cover of the Galloway's speech advertised that the piece had been translated from English, and even translated the Latin motto: 'Audi et alteram Partem' [listen to both sides] into German. The translation of Franklin's *Narrative* declared on the title page that the text was from the English.<sup>73</sup> And the German version of Dickinson's speech even specified that it was the from

---

<sup>69</sup> *Getreue Warnung gegen Lockvogel*, p. 10.

<sup>70</sup> Wellenreuther, *Citizens in a Strange Land*, pp. 214 – 5. A. G. Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property: German Lutherans in Colonial British America* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), pp. 284 – 7.

<sup>71</sup> Joseph Galloway, *Die Rede, Herrn Joseph Galloways, eines der Mitglieder des Hauses für Philadelphia Cauntty* (Philadelphia; Henry Miller, 1764), Evans 9673, p. 46.

<sup>72</sup> Wellenreuther, *Citizens in a Strange Land*, p. 19.

<sup>73</sup> Franklin, Benjamin, *Historische Nachricht von dem nenlich in Lancaster Cauntty durch unbekante Personen ausgeführten Blutbade über eine Anzahl Indianer* ([Ephrata], 1764), Evans 9666.

the second edition.<sup>74</sup> One of the difficulties of studying the professional code is disambiguating the work of the various professionals from the input of the author. In many cases, there is not enough evidence to make a definitive identification of who encoded the signal into the text, but this ambiguity is not fatal for analysing the professional code. Instead, the relationship between the words and printed object can reveal insights into the development of ideas in the German and English language communities.

A study of the nuances of German translations would be an article in itself, but the variations between German- and English-language Paxton Boys texts suggest the choices of print professionals affected the information German audiences received. Like their English-language counterparts, German print professionals highlighted elements within a text through the printed form. Henry Miller printed the *Protestation gegen die Bestellung Herrn Benjamin Franklins zu einem Agenten für diese Provinz*. The piece listed a number of complaints against Franklin as Pennsylvania's agent in London, arguing that his support of royal government and opposition to the proprietary government would perpetuate the divisions within Pennsylvania.<sup>75</sup> In his reply, Franklin said that he wrote in order to defend the House against insinuations made in the piece. He also highlighted that yet again it was the publication of a minority opinion that sparked the debate. Henry Miller printed only the translated protest against Franklin, but Christoph Saur printed both the protest and Franklin's answer in a compilation edition.<sup>76</sup> Saur's motivation in giving his opponent a right to reply to his critics in this edition is unclear. Perhaps Saur believed in the principle of equal access to the press, perhaps it was a business decision to make the expanded text more attractive than Miller's, or perhaps, since the two examples are unsigned, then the attribution to Saur is incorrect. Crucially, however, the English versions of the dispute (i.e. *A Protest Presented to the House of the Assembly* from Bradford and *Remarks on a Late Protest* from the shop of Franklin and Hall) were printed individually without the compilation effect. In translating and then compiling the two rejoinder texts, each from different print shops, this edition engaged its audience in the divisiveness of the ongoing debate in a way that English readers did not experience.

---

<sup>74</sup> John Dickinson, *Eine Rede, gehalten in dem Hause der Assembly der Provinz Pennsylvanien, am 24ten May, 1764* (Philadelphia; Henry Miller, 1764), Evans 9643

<sup>75</sup> *Protestation gegen die Bestellung Herrn Benjamin Franklins zu einem Agenten für diese Provinz* (Philadelphia; Henry Miller, 1764), Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

<sup>76</sup> *Protestation gegen die Bestellung Herrn Benjamin Franklins zu einem Agenten für diese Provinz* ([Germantown; Christoph Saur, 1764]), Evans 9668.

Some translated texts explicitly acknowledged their political contribution to the printed forum. Early in the debate over royal government, Franklin had printed and distributed one hundred copies of a petition for a new royal charter. Armbruster then printed a German version of this same petition with a short note to explain that the petition had been translated specifically so that the signatories could understand what they were signing.<sup>77</sup> Armbruster's note acknowledged the political significance of providing a German translation of a text. Perhaps for the same reason, the German version of Dickinson's counterpetition also stated it was translated from the English version.<sup>78</sup> This same concern for the engagement of the German-speaking audience was evident in Armbruster's translation of *An Historical Account*. On the last page, Armbruster promised to address complaints that texts available in English would soon be printed in German.<sup>79</sup> The note was, obviously, missing from the original English piece and so was part of a dialogue between Armbruster and his German readers. The note is a reminder of the complex interrelationship of printers' interventions. Printing texts in German served explicit political ends by incorporating Germans into the Paxton Boys debate. At the same time, Armbruster was also in a conversation with his customers about providing products for sale. Moving the debate from the State House into public prints meant marrying together these political and commercial aims.

However, the political motivations of printers should not be overdetermined. In exploring the implications of the professional code, it does not necessarily follow that the print professional's motivation aligned with the intellectual or political signals ultimately encoded into the text. Printing was a business and the commercial considerations should not be ignored. The urgency of financial matters may have been particularly important for Armbruster because he struggled throughout his life with money. In the 1750s, Armbruster defaulted on a loan and lost his press to conveyancers Lewis Weiss and Peter Miller. Franklin restored Armbruster's press in 1762, but by the end of 1764, Armbruster had mortgaged his printing furniture and supplies again. Even the printing windfall of the Paxton Boys debate had not been enough to cover the expenses of his business. After defaulting on his mortgage and losing his shop, Armbruster became a treasure hunter looking for hidden pirate caches, though never finding any. Toward

---

<sup>77</sup> Franklin, *Petition of the Freeholders and Inhabitants of the Province of Pennsylvania* [29 March 1764], BFP, XI, pp. 145–147. *An seine königliche Majestät, in dero Rath* ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764]), Evans 41481.

<sup>78</sup> *Seiner königlichen erhabenen Majestät im hohen Rath* ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764]), Evans 9833.

<sup>79</sup> *Eine Historische Beschreibung von den Letztthin Philadelphia* (Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764), Evans 9698, p. 8.

the end of his life he wrote again to Franklin asking for help and describing his impoverished condition.<sup>80</sup> Armbruster's travails are a reminder that print was a business. His prodigious output of Paxton Boys texts and German translations likely reflect his ongoing money concerns perhaps more than a dedication to the issues of western Pennsylvania, especially as he printed texts from both sides of debate. Ultimately, the professional code had political implications for the audiences of the Paxton Boys texts, but it does not mean that printers, or any print professionals, were themselves acting with political intent

Steuart is perhaps the clearest example of how a print professional used the professional code autonomously without necessarily imposing his personal politics on the text. His connection to the Irish re-printing trade may have had political implications for his supplier in Ireland or the Ulster audiences in Pennsylvania, but Steuart as a businessman was more mercenary. In Isaiah Thomas' recollection of early American printing, Steuart was known as 'not over nice as it respected the work of others.'<sup>81</sup> Steuart's dispute with the Presbyterian minister Francis Hopkinson over reprinting Hopkinson's work is demonstrative of this unscrupulous approach. In 1762, only fourteen days after its original publication, Steuart printed an unauthorised edition of Hopkinson's poem *Science*, which Hopkinson complained contained many errors. The year after, Steuart published an unauthorised edition of Hopkinson's Latin textbook. Again Hopkinson alleged that Steuart's version contained many errors and so published a text called *Errata, or the Art of Printing Incorrectly* that censured Steuart's ability to print.<sup>82</sup> Steuart responded with *The Ass in Lyon's Skin* which did not engage the ethics of re-printing and readily admitted that 'in a hurry of Business' errors in the impression had occurred, but claimed that the substantive mistakes were Hopkinson's own.<sup>83</sup> Steuart defended his re-printing activities robustly, and this same brazen attitude can be seen on the title pages of some of the Paxton Boys texts. On the third edition of *An Historical Account*, Armbruster accused Steuart of pirating his edition. Armbruster called Steuart 'Steuars-Stockfish' and

---

<sup>80</sup> Isaiah Thomas, *The History of Printing in America with a Biography of Printers and an Account of Newspapers*, 2 vols (Albany, NY; Joel Munsell, 1874), I, pp. 248 – 50. Anthony Armbruster, 'Chattel Mortgage and Inventory', BFP, XII, pp. 342 – 345. Anthony Armbruster to Benjamin Franklin, 12 November 1785, in BFP, XLIII, p. 557. Armbruster to Franklin, 26 April 1786, in BFP, XLIV, p. 82.

<sup>81</sup> Isaiah Thomas, *History of Printing in America*, I, p. 252.

<sup>82</sup> Mary Shepherd, 'Forrest's Curious Old Play: or, Hopkinson's Disappointment', *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 88:1 (1994), 37 – 52, (p. 41).

<sup>83</sup> [Andrew Steuart], *The Ass in the Lyon's Skin; Luckily Discovered by his Braying* (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9519.



claimed the text was printed at Rome, both references insinuate that Steuart was a papist.<sup>84</sup> Steuart responded by printing a revised second edition of Armbruster's *A Serious Address* to which he snidely appended a note to the title page that it was 'Re-printed from the FIRST EDITION (printed by Mr. *Armbuster*)'.<sup>85</sup> These were additions to the debate that audiences decoded, but they dealt mainly with the commercial considerations of the printers rather than the author's content.

Yet, these commercial additions could still reinforce or undermine the author's preferred meaning. On Steuart's edition of *The Address of the People Call'd Quakers*, he advertised on the title page that his printing shop was 'a little below the Friend's Meeting-House'.<sup>86</sup> As discussed above, the pamphlet refuted accusations made in *Declaration and Remonstrance* against the Quakers. Steuart's intervention was a way to direct his imagined audience to his print shop, but in so doing, he reinforced the pamphlet's association with Quaker worship. At other times, Steuart encouraged readers to engage broadly with inflammatory texts. Steuart announced on the front of the third edition of *Copy of a Letter from Charles Read* that for any interested party 'all the pamphlets that have been published on the same subject' could be had at his shop.<sup>87</sup> This intervention aimed to perpetuate the debate by encouraging audiences to involve themselves in the dispute. Likewise, on the title page of Steuart's small edition of *Plain Dealer*, he claimed that the other numbers of *Plain Dealer* could be had from him as well as 'all other political pamphlets that have been publish'd since the commencement of the present disputes'.<sup>88</sup> The note was most likely Steuart's addition because the author, Hugh Williamson, included a note in the third instalment of *Plain Dealer* disavowing authorship of the second instalment, printed by Steuart, and asking his current printer, Dunlap, to print all editions of *Plain Dealer* in the same size format as the first edition printed by Steuart.<sup>89</sup> The associations that Steuart drew between places and other texts in the debate emphasised the disputed

---

<sup>84</sup> *An Historical Account of the Late Disturbance Between the Inhabitants of the Back Settlements of Pennsylvania and the Philadelphians* (Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, [1764]), Evans 9697.

<sup>85</sup> *A Serious Address to such of the Inhabitants of Pennsylvania as have Cannived [sic] at, or do Approve of, the Late Massacre of the Indians at Lancaster* (Philadelphia; [Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9834. *A Serious Address* [...] *Re-printed from the First Edition* (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9836.

<sup>86</sup> Society of Friends, *The Address of the People Call'd Quakers, in the Province of Pennsylvania, to John Penn, Esquire, Lieutenant-Governor of the said Province* (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9670.

<sup>87</sup> Charles Read, *Copy of a Letter from Charles Read* [...] *The Third Edition* (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9811.

<sup>88</sup> [Hugh Williamson], *The Plain Dealer; Numb. I. Or A Few Remarks upon Quaker-Politics* (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), New York Historical Society.

<sup>89</sup> [Williamson, Hugh], *The Plain Dealer; Or Remarks Upon Quaker Politics in Pennsylvania Numb III To be Continued* (Philadelphia; [William Dunlap], 1764), Evans 9878, p. 2.

nature of the debate and were likely decisions the printer made autonomously for his own commercial concerns.

This same behaviour became prescriptive on *Quaker Unmask'd*. The pamphlet was one of the most inflammatory texts. Steuart affixed at the back of the work a checklist of fourteen texts ‘relative to the Disputes in this Province’.<sup>90</sup> In the checklist, Steuart effectively curated the debate for a reading audience, and his decisions can provide another insight into the character of the debate. Of the fourteen tracts, only four were not pairs of rejoinder texts. The outlying four were *Address of the Quakers*, and three doggerel verses, including *Cloven-Foot Discovered* as well as *Paxtonaide* and *The Paxton Boys, A Farce*, which were anti-Paxton poems that mocked the Paxton Boys march on Philadelphia. The remaining ten were divided between five texts that directly refuted the five other texts on the list.<sup>91</sup> Interestingly, the list does not contain everything that Steuart had printed for the debate in 1764. He had printed a version of *An Historical Account* that is absent and he listed Franklin’s *Narrative* where the only extant editions were printed by Franklin and Hall. This is suggestive that he curated his list. The preponderance of rejoinder texts emphasised the divisive nature of the dispute. Audiences received instruction through the professional code that guided them through the print forum. This is a distinct element of printed debate. The professional code had political implications for the preferred meaning of the author, yet as Steuart’s actions suggest, the professionals themselves were not necessarily political in their motivation.

There is a lot to be gained by looking specifically at the interaction between the words on the page and the technical transformations entailed in turning those words into a consumable product. As briefly discussed above, the network of print professionals extended far beyond the press itself and there is more to analyse about the political implications of the various contributing professionals. For example, the work of the compositor in selecting italics and spaces established printing conventions that created significant intertextual associations between texts, effectively creating print genres. Saur’s *Getreue Warnung gegen Lockvögel* followed the established custom of using Fraktur type for the German translation of

<sup>90</sup> [David James Dove], *The Quaker Unmask'd; or, Plain Truth* (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9647.

<sup>91</sup> *Narrative of the Late Massacre* was refuted by *Conduct of the Paxton Men. Declaration and Remonstrance* was refuted by a *Dialogue on the Declaration and Remonstrance. Copy of a Letter from Charles Read* was refuted by *A Letter from a Gentleman in Elizabeth Town. Quaker Unmask'd* was refuted by *A Looking Glass for Presbyterians. A Plain Dealer* was refuted by *An Address to the Freeholders and Inhabitants of the Province of Pennsylvania*.

Franklin's 'Palatine Boors' comment and Caslon for the English source, which suggests that typographical dialects had significance for audiences decoding the page.<sup>92</sup> The various formats of the Paxton Boys must have involved different distribution methods that shaped the point of contact between audience and text. Similarly, the date of circulation conveyed meaning, especially in texts like *To the Public* which Galloway circulated days before the annual election as a final push for his doomed re-election campaign.<sup>93</sup> In summary, the work of understanding how audiences decoded the relationship between the signals encoded by the author and the signals from print professionals has only been briefly touched upon.

Ultimately, in the absence of an effective government response, the Paxton Boys texts were the forum for deciding the province's response to the massacre and riot. A broad variety of readers encountered contributions from multiple authors, each of which was in turn overlaid with signals from print professionals. The cacophony of signals entailed within printed discussion has an inflammatory effect on the development of a debate. Longstanding social divisions, politically charged rhetoric, and simmering ethnic conflict were all exacerbated by being discussed through a printed medium in which the intervention of printers generally served to emphasise the most explosive elements of an author's argument. As a case study for the role of print in eighteenth-century Pennsylvania politics, the Paxton Boys debate is suggestive that the move from formal politics to printed debate stoked incendiary positions. As such, 1764 could serve as a model to understand how the deadlock of imperial politics in the 1760s and 1770s encouraged colonists to move the debate from within doors out into texts on the streets, and how, in turn, this shaped the character of the American Revolution in Pennsylvania.

---

<sup>92</sup> *Getreue Warnung gegen Lockvögel* (Philadelphia; [Henry Miller], 1764), Evans 9865, p. 10.

<sup>93</sup> Joseph Galloway, *To The Public, Philadelphia September 29, 1764* ([Philadelphia; William Dunlap, 1764]), Evans 9674.

## Appendix 1: Catalogue of 1764 Paxton Boys Texts

Title	Physical Description	Explicit	Relevance	Attribution
Pennsylvania Province, <i>An Act for Preventing Tumults</i> ([Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall], 1764), Evans 9782	pp. 4. fol	Explicit	late several dangerous tumults and riot' p. 1	Signed author, but anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The Addition to the Epitaph without the Copper-Plate</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764]), Evans 9645	broadside	Explicit	<i>Paxtonian</i>	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attributed the text to the Armbruster press, and incorrectly ascribed David James Dove as the author.
<i>An address of thanks to the wardens of Christ Church and St. Peters, :and the Reverend W---S---h. D.D. provost of the college and tool to the p---r, and J---b D---é A.M. and MV.D. From F--- A.---n D.D. and J---n E---g in their own name and in the name of all the Presbyterian ministers in Pennsylvania</i> ([Philadelphia, 1764]), Evans 9560.	broadside	Explicit	<i>Paxton Men, (our dear Brethren)</i>	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
Society of Friends, <i>The Address of the People Call'd Quakers, in the Province of Pennsylvania, to John Penn, Esquire, Lieutenant-Governor of the said Province</i> (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9670.	pp. 11. 8vo	Explicit	Discusses hiding the Indians in the barracks during the march, p. 10.	Signed author and printed by Steuart. Internal attribution.
<i>Anmerckungen über ein noch nie erbört und gesehen Wunder Thier in Pennsylvanien</i> ([Germantown; Christoph Saur, 1764]), Evans 9578	pp. 16. 8vo	Explicit	‘das Land voll Aufruhr, Gewalttätigkeit, und Verwirrung sey, p. 6	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.

<i>An Answer to the Pamphlet Entitled The Conduct of the Paxton Men</i> (Philadelphia, Anthony Armbruster, 1764), Evans 9580	pp. 28. 8vo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author, but printed by Armbruster. Internal attribution.
<i>The Author of Quaker Unmask'd Strip'd Start [sic] Naked, or The Delineated Presbyterian Play'd Hob With</i> (Philadelphia; [Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9586.	pp. 12. 8vo	Explicit	Sett of Murderers and Rioters', p. 6.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>A Battle! A Battle! A Battle a Squirt; Where no Man is Kill'd, and no Man is Hurt!</i> (Germantown [Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764]), Evans 9596.	pp. 11, 1 plate. 12mo	Explicit	Paxton Boys by name, p. 4.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>A Battle! A Battle! A Battle of Squirt; Where no Man is Kill'd, and no Man is Hurt!</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9595.	pp. 20. 8vo	Explicit	Paxton Boys by name, p. 6.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The Cheat Unmask'd: Being a Refutation of that Illegitimate Letter said to be Wrote by a Clergyman in Town</i> ([Philadelphia; Henry Miller], 1764), Evans 9614.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	<i>Paxton Lads'</i> , p. 4	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
[Barton, Thomas], <i>The Conduct of the Paxton-Men Impartially Represented</i> (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9594.	pp. (2), 34. 8vo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Author attribution: James Myers, 'The Rev. Thomas Barton's Authorship of The Conduct of the Paxton Men, Impartially Represented (1764)', <i>Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies</i> , 61:2 (1994), 155 – 184

[Franklin, Benjamin], <i>Cool Thoughts on the Present Situation of our Public Affairs</i> (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764) Evans, 9664.	pp. 20. 8vo	Explicit	Mobs assemble and Kill, p. 6.	Anonymous author, but printed by Steuart. Evans attribution.
[Franklin, Benjmain], <i>Cool Thoughts on the Present Situation of our Public Affairs</i> (Philadelphia; William Dunlap, 1764), Evans 9663.	pp. 22. 8vo	Explicit	Mobs assemble and Kill, p. 8.	Anonymous author, but printed by Dunlap. Evans attribution.
Read, Charles, <i>Copy of a Letter from Charles Read</i> (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9809.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Outrage committed in Lancaster, p. 2.	Signed author and printed by Stueart. Internal attribution.
Read, Charles, <i>Copy of a Letter from Charles Read [...] The Third Edition</i> (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9811.	pp.8. 8vo	Explicit	Outrage committed in Lancaster, p. 2.	Signed author and printed by Stueart. Internal attribution.
Smith, Matthew, and James Gibson, <i>A Declaration and Remonstrance of the Distressed and Bleeding Frontier Inhabitants of the Province of Pennsylvania</i> ([Philadelphia]; [William Bradford], 1764), Evans 9630.	pp. 18. 8vo	Explicit	Refers to the massacre at Conestoga, p. 3.	Signed author, but anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>A Dialogue between Andrew Trueman and Thomas Zealot about the Killing the Indians at Cannestogoe and Lancaster</i> (Ephesus [Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9634.	pp. 7. 8vo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author, but false imprint. Evans attribution.

<i>A Dialogue between Andrew Trueman and Thomas Zealot about the Killing the Indians at Cannestogoe and Loncaster</i> (Ephesus [Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9635.	pp. 7. 8vo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author, but false imprint. Evans attribution.
<i>A Dialogue Containing some Reflections on the Late Declaration and Remonstrance, of the Back-Inhabitants of the Province of Pennsylvania with a Serious and Short Address to those Presbyterians, who (to their dishonor) have too much Abetted and Conniv'd at the Late Insurrection</i> (Philadelphia; [Andrew Steuart, 1764]), Evans 9638.	pp. 16. 16mo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The Election a Medley, humbly inscribed, to Squire Lilliput Professor of Scurrillity</i> ([Philadelphia, 1764]), Evans 9650.	broadside folio	Explicit	Paxton Riot'	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Digital Paxton.
<i>Franklin and the Quakers</i> ([Philadelphia, 1764]), Library Company of Philadelphia.	broadside, 19 x 33 cm	Explicit	Refers to the 'Paxton Spirit'	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Digital Paxton.
<i>Getreue Warnung gegen Lockvögel</i> (Philadelphia; [Henry Miller], 1764), Evans 9865.	pp. 15. 8vo	Explicit	die Lancaster Indianer Affair, p. 13	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>An Historical Account of the Late Disturbance Between the Inhabitants of the Back Settlements of Pennsylvania and the Philadelphians</i> (Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, [1764]), Evans 9697.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Subtitle: The Inhabitants of the Back Settlements of Pennsylvania are the Paxton Boys	Anonymous author, but printed by Armbruster. Internal attribution.

<i>An Historical Account of the Late Disturbance Between the Inhabitants of the Back Settlements of Pennsylvania and the Philadelphians</i> (Rome [Philadelphia]; A.S. [Anthony Armbruster], [1764]), Library Company of Philadelphia.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Subtitle: The Inhabitants of the Back Settlements of Pennsylvania are the Paxton Boys	Anonymous author and false imprint. Evans attribution.
<i>Eine Historische Beschreibung von den Letztthin Philadelphia</i> (Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764), Evans 9698	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Title page	Anonymous author, but printed by Armbruster. Internal attribution.
<i>Historische Nachricht von dem neulich in Lancaster Caunty durch unbekante Personen ausgeführten Blutbade über eine Anzahl Indianer</i> ([Ephrata], 1764), Evans 9666	pp. 32. 8vo	Explicit	Title page	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
Smith, Matthew, and James Gibson, <i>Eine dem hochedlen Herrn Guvernör und der Landesversammlung der Provinz Pennsylvanien</i> ([Philadelphia; Henry Miller], 1764), Evans 9631	pp. 16. 8vo	Explicit	Discusses the Conestoga massacre in the opening lines, p. 3	Signed author, but anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>Am Indian Squaw King Wampum Spies</i> ([Philadelphia, 1764]), Library Company of Philadelphia.	broadside, 21 x 26 cm	Explicit	Refers to the Quakers taking up arms against the rioters	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Digital Paxton.
<i>Letter from a Clergyman in Town</i> ([Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart], 1764), Evans 9716.	pp. 8. 4to	Explicit	<i>Paxton Boys'</i> , p. 4.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>A Letter from a Gentleman at Elizabeth-Town</i> (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9774.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Questions whether it is appropriate to call the Paxton Boys murderers, p. 4.	Anonymous author, but printed by Steuart. Internal attribution.



<i>A Letter from a Gentleman in Transilvania to his Friend in America</i> (New York [Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9701.	pp. 12. 8vo	Explicit	Allegorical reference to the Piss-Brute-tarians massacring innocent Natives, pp. 4 - 5	Anonymous author and false imprint. Evans attribution.
<i>A Letter, from Batista Angeloni [...] To which is Added, The Cloven-Foot Discovered</i> (Carolina [Philadelphia, 1764]), Evans 9838.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Line: 'Thus, what you one time disavow/ You at another will allow' is a reference to the Quakers taking up arms to resist the Paxton Boys	Original author with unsigned additions and a false imprint. Seidensticker attribution.
<i>A Letter, from Batista Angeloni [...] To which is Added, The Cloven-Foot Discovered</i> (Ephrata [Philadelphia, 1764]), Evans 9839.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Line: 'Thus, what you one time disavow/ You at another will allow' is a reference to the Quakers taking up arms to resist the Paxton Boys	Original author with unsigned additions and a false imprint. Seidensticker attribution.
[Hunt, Isaac], <i>A Looking Glass for Presbyterians</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1744 [1764]), Evans 9703.	pp. 39. 8vo	Explicit	Murdering the Indians at Lancaster', p. 9.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
[Hunt, Isaac], <i>A Looking-Glass for Presbyterians. Or A Brief Examination of their Loyalty, Merit, and Other Qualifications for Government. Numb. I.</i> (Philadelphia; [Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9702.	pp. 18. 8vo	Explicit	Murdering the Indians at Lancaster', p. 10.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>Eine Lustige-Aria</i> ([Philadelphia; Henry Miller, 1764]), Evans 9715	broadside	Explicit	Pecksan Bay', p. 1.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
[Franklin, Benjamin], <i>A Narrative of the Late Massacres in Lancaster County of a Number of Indians, Friends of this Province, by Persons Unknown</i> ([Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall], 1764), Evans 9667.	pp. 31. 8vo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Miller attribution.

[Franklin, Benjamin], <i>A Narrative of the Late Massacres in Lancaster County of a Number of Indians, Friends of this Province, by Persons Unknown</i> [variant setting] ([Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall], 1764), Library Company of Philadelphia	pp. 31. 8vo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Digital Paxton.
<i>The Paxton Boys, A Farce</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9776.	pp. 16. 16mo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The Paxton Boys, A Farce</i> (Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764), Evans 9777.	pp. 16. 16mo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author, but printed by Armbruster. Internal attribution.
<i>The Paxton Expedition; Inscribed to the Author of the Farce</i> ([Philadelphia, 1764]), Evans 9627.	broadside, 25 x 36 cm	Explicit	Refers to the Paxtonians in the poem	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The Paxtonaide; A Poem</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9685.	pp. 8. 4to	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The Paxtonaide; A Poem</i> [...] <i>The Second Edition</i> (Philadelphia; John Morris, 1764), Evans 9686.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author, but printed by Morris. Internal attribution.
[Williamson, Hugh], <i>The Plain Dealer: or, A Few Remarks upon Quaker-Politicks, and their Attempts to Change the Government of Pennsylvania</i> [...] Numb. I. <i>To be Continued</i> (Philadelphia; [Andrew Steuart], 1764), Evans 9875.	pp. 16. 8vo	Explicit	Refers to the Quakers taking up arms against the Paxton Boys, p. 10	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.

[Williamson, Hugh], <i>The Plain Dealer; Numb. I. Or A Few Remarks upon Quaker-Politics</i> (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), New York Historical Society.	pp. 19. 16mo	Explicit	Refers to the Quakers taking up arms against the Paxton Boys, p. 10	Anonymous author, but printed by Steuart. Evans attribution.
Dickinson, John, David MacCanaughy, John Montgomery, et al, and Benjamin Franklin, <i>Protestation gegen die Bestellung Herrn Benjamin Franklins zu einem Agenten für diese Provinz</i> ([Germantown; Christoph Saur, 1764]), Evans 9668	pp. 4. fol	Explicit	den ich in dem Widerstände gegen die Mörder, p. 2	Signed author, but anonymous printer. Seidensticker attribution.
[Dove, David James], <i>The Quaker Unmask'd; or, Plain Truth</i> (Philadelphia; [Andrew Steuart], 1764), Evans 9646.	pp. 15. 8vo	Explicit	Discusses the Paxton Volunteers, p. 3.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
[Dove, David James], <i>The Quaker Unmask'd; or, Plain Truth</i> , 2 ed (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9647.	pp. 16. 16mo	Explicit	Discusses the Paxton Volunteers, p. 3.	Anonymous author, but printed by Steuart. Evans attribution.
<i>The Quaker Vindicated; or, Observations on a Late Pamphlet Entitled, The Quaker unmask'd, or, Plain Truth</i> ([Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart], 1764), Evans 9805.	pp. 16. 8vo	Explicit	Refers to the 'late insurrection', p. 3.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The Quakers Assisting to Preserve the Lives of the Indians in the Barracks</i> (Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764), Evans 9806.	pp. 16. 16mo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author, but printed by Armbruster. Internal attribution.
<i>The Quakers Assisting to Preserve the Lives of the Indians in the Barracks, Numb II</i> (Philadelphia; [Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9807.	pp. 12. 8vo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.

Dickinson, John, <i>Eine Rede, gehalten in dem Hause der Assembly der Provinz Pennsylvanien, am 24ten May, 1764</i> (Philadelphia; Henry Miller, 1764), Evans 9643	pp. xvi, 35. 8vo	Explicit	'ein schauplass von aufruhr, unterdruckung, und verwirnung', p. xv	Signed author and printed by Miller. Internal attribution.
Galloway, Joseph, <i>Die Rede, Herrn Joseph Galloways, eines der Mitglieder des Hauses für Philadelphia Cauntly</i> (Philadelphia; Henry Miller, 1764), Evans 9673	pp. xlv, (4), 46. 8vo	Explicit	'eine gesetzlose, afrührische, mörderischerotte', p. xxii	Signed author and printed by Miller. Internal attribution.
Franklin, Benjamin, <i>Remarks on a Late Protest against the Appointment of Mr. Franklin an Agent for this Province</i> ([Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall, 1764]), Evans 9669.	pp. 7. 8vo	Explicit	opposing the Murderers', p. 3.	Signed author, but anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>Remarks on The Quaker Unmask'd; or Plain Truth Found to be Plain falshood</i> [sic] (Philadelphia; John Morris, [1764]), Evans 9813.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Discusses the rioter's friends and lawless proceedings, p. 2.	Anonymous author, but printed by Morris. Internal attribution.
<i>Remarks upon the Delineated Presbyterian Play'd Hob with; or Clothes for a Stark Naked Author</i> (Philadelphia, Anthony Armbruster, 1764), Evans 9814.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Discusses the Paxton People, p. 6.	Anonymous author, but printed by Armbruster. Internal attribution.
Pennsylvania Province, <i>Resolves of the Assembly of Pennsylvania, March 24, 1764</i> ([Philadelphia, 1764]), Evans 41483	broadside	Explicit	Proprietaries taking, Advantage of Times of public Calamity to extort Privileges from the People'	Signed author, but anonymous printer. Bristol attribution.
<i>A Scene in the First Act of a New Farce</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764]), Evans 9829.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Refers to the <i>Paxtonian</i> Expedition on the title page	Anonymous author and false imprint. Evans attribution.

<i>Ein Schön Weltlich Lied</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9830	broadside	Explicit	fechten ich euch nicht sah'	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The Scribler; Being a Letter from a Gentleman</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9831.	pp. 24. 8vo	Explicit	murdering brethren', p. 15.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>Seiner königlichen erhabensten Majestät im hohen Rath</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764]), Evans 9833	pp. 2. fol	Explicit	Und der ein Geist der Gewaltthatigkeit, der Aufruhr und Derwörung, die Oberhand unter uns habe	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>A Serious Address</i> [...] <i>Re-printed from the First Edition</i> (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9836.	pp. 12. 16mo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author, but signed by Steuart. Internal attribution.
<i>A Serious Address</i> [...] <i>The Demand for this Piece has been so Great that this Fourth Edition is call'd for in a Few Days</i> (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764), Evans 9837.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author, but signed by Steuart. Internal attribution.
<i>A Serious Address to such of the Inhabitants of Pennsylvania as have Cannived [sic] at, or do Approve of, the Late Massacre of the Indians at Lancaster</i> (Philadelphia; [Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9834.	pp. 12. 16mo	Explicit	Title Page	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
Dickinson, John, <i>A Speech Delivered in the House of Assembly of the Province of Pennsylvania, May 24th, 1764</i> (Philadelphia; William Bradford, 1764), Evans 9641.	pp. xii, 30. 8vo	Explicit	Smith denies that Pennsylvania is province of riot as part of a defence of the Paxton Boys, p. xii. 'late tumultuous and riotous proceedings', p. 18.	Signed author and signed printer. Internal attribution.

Dickinson, John, <i>A Speech Delivered in the House of Assembly of the Province of Pennsylvania, May 24th, 1764</i> [...] <i>The Second Edition</i> (Philadelphia; William Bradford, 1764) Evans 9642.	pp. xv, 30. 8vo	Explicit	Smith denies that Pennsylvania is province of riot as part of a defence of the Paxton Boys, p. xiv. 'late tumultuous and riotous proceedings', p. 18.	Signed author and signed printer. Internal attribution.
Galloway, Joseph, <i>The Speech of Joseph Galloway, Esq</i> [...] <i>Delivered in the House of Assembly, of the Province of Pennsylvania, May 24, 1764</i> (Philadelphia; William Dunlap, 1764), [variant setting] Library Company of Philadelphia.	pp. xxxv, (3) 45. 8vo	Explicit	Franklin calls it a 'lawless Murdering Mob', p. xviii. 'Armed mobs', p. 35.	Signed author and signed printer. Internal attribution.
Galloway, Joseph, <i>The Speech of Joseph Galloway, Esq</i> [...] <i>Delivered in the House of Assembly, of the Province of Pennsylvania, May 24, 1764</i> (Philadelphia; William Dunlap, 1764), Evans 9671.	pp. xxxv, (3) 45. 8vo	Explicit	Franklin calls it a 'lawless Murdering Mob', p. xviii. 'Armed mobs', p. 35.	Signed author and signed printer. Internal attribution.
<i>The Squabble: A Pastoral Eclogue</i> [...] <i>from the First Edition</i> (Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, [1764]), Evans 9565.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Allegorical reference to Dogs, i.e. Paxton Boys, devouring wolves, i.e. the Contesgoa residents, p. 5.	Anonymous author, but printed by Steuart. Evans attribution.
<i>The Squabble: A Pastoral Eclogue</i> [...] <i>The Second Edition</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9564.	pp. 8. 4to	Explicit	Allegorical reference to Dogs, i.e. Paxton Boys, devouring wolves, i.e. the Contesgoa residents, p. 5.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The Substance of a Council held at Lancaster August the 28th 1764 by a Committee of Presbyterian Ministers and Elders Deputed from all Parts of Pennsylvania in order to Settle the Ensuing Election of Members for the Assembly</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9848.	pp.19. 8vo	Explicit	Killing the savages in this place: marching to <i>Germantown</i> ; and intimidating the <i>Assembly</i> ', p. 3.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attributed Armbruster as the printer and, less convincingly, ascribed Franklin as the author

<i>To the Freeholders and Electors for the City and County of Philadelphia and Counties of Chester and Bucks</i> ([Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall, 1764]), Evans 9854.	pp. 2. fol	Explicit	<i>Paxton Rioters'</i> , p. 1.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>To the Freeholdrs [sic] and Electors of the City and County of Philadelphia</i> ([Philadelphia; William Bradford, 1764]), Evans 9853.	pp.2. fol	Explicit	<i>Paxton Men'</i> , p. 2.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
Pennsylvania Province, <i>To the King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council</i> ([Philadelphia; Henry Miller, 1764]), Evans 9786	pp. 2. fol	Explicit	'Spirit of Violence, Riot, and Confusion' p. 1	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>A Touch on the Times</i> ([Philadelphia, 1764]), Evans 41494.	pp. 4. 4to	Explicit	<i>Wretched Paxtons'</i> , p. 1.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Sabin attribution.
[Williamson, Hugh], <i>What is Sauce for a Goose is also Sauce for a Gander</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9879.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Advises that in the wilderness you have to guard against 'Wolves of the Forest' and 'Stinging Snakes of the Mountains' and 'Beware of taking them to our Bosom' as a reference to the justification of the Paxton Boys for the massacre, p. 8.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
[Williamson, Hugh], <i>What is Sauce for a Goose is also Sauce for a Gander</i> [variant setting] (Philadelphia, 1764), Library Company of Philadelphia.	pp. 8. 8vo	Explicit	Advises that in the wilderness you have to guard against 'Wolves of the Forest' and 'Stinging Snakes of the Mountains' and 'Beware of taking them to our Bosom' as a reference to the justificaion of the Paxton Boys for the massacre, p. 8.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Digital Paxton.
<i>An Address Lately Presented to J---- G----- Esq</i> ([Philadelphia; William Bradford, 1764]), Evans 9559.	broadside 4to	Implicit	Respond to The Speech of Joseph Galloway and Dickinson's Reply to the Speech of Joseph Galloway	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.

<i>An Address to the Freeholders and Inhabitants of the Province of Pennsylvania in Answer to a Paper called the Plain Dealer</i> (Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764), Evans 9561.	pp. 12. 8vo	Implicit	Mentions Frontier defence and violence, but not the massacre or march. Directly addresses <i>Plain Dealer Numb I</i>	Anonymous author, but printed by Armbruster. Internal attribution.
<i>Advertisement and Not a Joke</i> ([Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall, 1764]), Evans 9562.	broadside 4to	Implicit	Respond the Speech of Joseph Galloway	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>An Die Freyhalter und Eimwohneb der Stadt und County Philadelphia, Deutscher Nation</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9575	pp. 4. 4to	Implicit	References <i>Gentleman Magazine</i> , p. 1	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>An seine königliche Majestät, in dero Rath</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764]), Evans 41481	broadside	Implicit	Translation of Franklin's petitions	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Bristol attribution.
<i>Eine Anrede an die Deutschen Freyhalter der Stadt und County Philadelphia</i> (Philadelphia; [Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9576	pp. 8. 8vo	Implicit	References <i>Gentleman Magazine</i> , p. 1	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
[Smith, William], <i>An Answer to Mr Franklin's Remarks on a Late Protest</i> (Philadelphia; William Bradford, 1764), Evans 9841.	pp. 22. 8vo	Implicit	References <i>Remarks on a Late Protest</i>	Anonymous author, but printed by Bradford. Evans attribution.
[Smith, William], <i>An Answer to Mr Franklin's Remarks on a Late Protest</i> , 2nd ed. (Philadelphia; William Bradford, 1764), Evans 9842.	pp. 22. 8vo	Implicit	References <i>Remarks on a Late Protest</i>	Anonymous author, but printed by Bradford. Evans attribution.



<i>An Answer to the Plot</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764]), Evans 9581.	broadside folio	Implicit	Responds to the Plot	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>A Conference between the D---l and Doctor D--e: Together with the Doctor's Epitaph on Himself</i> ([Philadelphia; Andrew Steuart, 1764]), Evans 9617.	broadside folio	Implicit	Refers to the Counter Medley	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The Counter-Medly being a Proper Answer to all the Dunces of the Medly and their Abettors</i> ([Philadelphia, Anthony Armbruster, 1764]), Evans 9943.	broadside folio	Implicit	Refers to the Election Medley	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>Etliche merckwürdige Punckten</i> (Philadelphia, Anthony Armbruster, 1764), Evans 9655	pp. 4. 4to	Implicit	Refers to the petition to the King, p. 2	Anonymous author, but printed by Armbruster. Internal attribution.
<i>Explanatory Remarks on the Assembly's Resolves Published in the Pennsylvania Gazette, no. 1840</i> ([Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall, 1764]), Evans 9656.	pp.2 fol	Implicit	Responds to the publication of Resolves	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The German Bleeds and Bear Ye Furs of Quaker Lords &amp; Savage Curs</i> ([Philadelphia, 1764]), Library Company of Philadelphia.	broadside, 19 x 25 cm	Implicit	Franklin holds a copy of the 24 March Assembly Resolves	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Digital Paxton.

<i>Höret ihr deutsche Bürger in Philadelphia, daß euch GOtt auch höre!</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764]), Historical Society of Pennsylvania	pp. 2. fol	Implicit	Pro-royal petitions	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Attribution: Hermann Wellenreuther, <i>Citizens in a Strange Land: A Study of German-American Broad­sides and their Meaning for Germans in North America, 1730 – 1830</i> (University Park, PA; Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013).
Dickinson, John, <i>Last Tuesday Morning Mr. Galloway Carried a Writing Containing some Reflections on Me to a Printer in this City and Desired that he would Insert it in his Next News Paper</i> ([Philadelphia; William Bradford, 1764]), Evans 9639.	pp. 4 8vo	Implicit	Respond to The Speech of Joseph Galloway, Dickinson's Speech, and Dickinson's Reply to the Speech of Joseph Galloway	Signed author, but anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>Der Lockvögel Warnungsgesang vor den Stossvögeln</i> ([Philadelphia; Henry Miller], 1764), Evans 9713.	pp. 8. 4to	Implicit	Reponds to Getreue Warnung gegen Lockvogel	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The Maybe or Some observations Occasion'd by Reading a Speech Deliver'd in the House of Assembly, the 24th. of May last by a Certain Eminent Patriot</i> (Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764), Evans 9736.	pp. 7. 8vo	Implicit	Responds to Dickinson's Speech	Anonymous author, but printed by Armbruster. Internal attribution.
<i>Eine Neue Anrede an die Deutschen in Philadelphia Caunty</i> (Philadelphia, [Henry Miller], 1764), Evans 9747.	pp. 4. 4to	Implicit	Responds to Getreue Warnung gegen Lockvogel	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.

<i>Observations on a Late Epitaph in a Letter from a Gentleman in the Country to his Friend in Philadelphia</i> (Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764), Evans 9772.	pp. 8. 8vo	Implicit	References a Conference between the Devil and Dove	Anonymous author, but printed by Armbruster. Internal attribution.
[Franklin, Benjamin], <i>The Petition of the Freeholders and Inhabitants of the Province of Pennsylvania [29 March 1764]</i> (Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall, 1764), <i>The Papers of Benjamin Franklin</i> , ed. by Leonard W. Labaree (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1967), XI, pp. 145 –147.	broadside	Implicit	Responds to the petitions from throughout Pennsylvania, including from the Paxton Boys themselves	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Attribution: <i>The Papers of Benjamin Franklin</i> , ed. by Leonard W. Labaree (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1967), XI, pp. 145
<i>The Plain Dealer: Numb. II</i> (Philadelphia, [Andrew Steuart], 1764), Evans 9877.	pp. 16. 8vo	Implicit	Refers to the distressed condition of the frontier, but not the massacre or march. Does refer to <i>Cool Thoughts</i> and <i>An Address to the Freeholders</i> , p. 4.	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attributed to the piece to the press of Steuart, but incorrectly identified Hugh Williamson as the author.
[Williamson, Hugh], <i>The Plain Dealer: Or Remarks Upon Quaker Politics in Pennsylvania Numb III To be Continued</i> (Philadelphia; [William Dunlap], 1764), Evans 9878.	pp. 24. 8vo	Implicit	Refers to <i>Cool Thoughts</i> and <i>An Address to the Freeholders</i>	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>The Plot by way of Burlesk to turn F-----n out of the Assembly; between H. and P; proprietary officers, being two of the Wiser sort</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster], 1764), Evans 9799.	broadside folio	Implicit	References events in coffee house as well as What is Sauce for the Goose	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.

Dickinson, John, David McCaughy, John Montgomery, et al, <i>A Protest Presented to the House of Assembly</i> , ([Philadelphia; William Bradford, 1764]), Evans 41484	broadside	Implicit	References Franklin's Royal Petition	Signed author, but anonymous printer. Bristol attribution.
Dickinson, John, David McCaughy, John Montgomery, et al, <i>Protestation gegen die Bestellung Herrn Benjamin Franklins zu einem Agenten für diese Provinz</i> (Philadelphia; [Henry Miller], 1764), Historical Society of Pennsylvania	broadside	Implicit	Translation of Dickinson's protest against Franklin	Signed author, but anonymous printer. Seidensticker attribution.
Dickinson, John, <i>A Receipt to Make a Speech By J----- G-----, Esquire</i> ([Philadelphia; William Bradford], [1764]), Evans 10472.	broadside 4to	Implicit	Responds to Galloway's Speech	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Paul Leicester Ford attribution to Dickinson in 1764; Hildeburn erroneously ascribed the piece to William Bradford in 1766
Dickinson, John, <i>A Reply to a Piece called the Speech of Joseph Galloway, Esquire</i> (Philadelphia; William Bradford, 1764), Evans 9640.	pp. iv, 45, xiii, 8vo	Implicit	Directly responds to The Speech of Joseph Galloway	Signed author and printed by Bradford. Internal attribution.
Pennsylvania Province, <i>Schlüsse der Assembly von Pennsylvanien</i> ([Philadelphia; Anthony Armbruster, 1764]), Private Collection in Russell D. Earnest and Corinne P. Earnest, <i>Flying Leaves and One-Sheets: Pennsylvania German Broad-sides, Fraktur, and their Printers</i> (New Castle, DE; Oak Knoll Press, 2005), pp. 134 – 5.	broadside	Implicit	Translation of the resolves passed by the Assembly	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Attribution: Russell D. Earnest and Corinne P. Earnest, <i>Flying Leaves and One-Sheets: Pennsylvania German Broad-sides, Fraktur, and their Printers</i> (New Castle, DE; Oak Knoll Press, 2005)

<i>To the Commissioners and Assessors of Chester County</i> ([Philadelphia; Franklin and Hall, 1764]), Evans 9852	broadside	Implicit	Refers to the Self-Assessment tax form intended to repel barbarous invasions	Anonymous author and anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
Galloway, Joseph, <i>To The Public, Philadelphia September 29, 1764</i> ([Philadelphia; William Dunlap], 1764), Evans 9674.	broadside folio	Implicit	Responds to Reply	Signed author, but anonymous printer. Evans attribution.
<i>Universal Peace-Maker; or a Modern Author's Instructor</i> (Philadelphia, Anthony Armbruster, 1764), Evans 9797	pp. 16. 8vo	Implicit	Title Page and March date refer to the Paxton Boys debate	Anonymous author, but printed by Armbruster. Internal attribution.